Published by :-
RISHI PUBLICATIONS
76, Chandrika Colony,
Varanasi - 221010
India.

1992

Rs.195/- $ 40.00 £ 25.00

ISBN : 81 - 85193 - 13 - 4

Composed at :-
Khandelwal Press & Publications,
Manmandir, Varanasi.

Printed at :-

वागर्थाविव संपृक्तौ वागर्थप्रतिपत्तये ।
जगतः पितरौ वन्दे पार्वतीपरमेश्वरौ ।।

- कृष्णकान्तिलल्लनजीगोपालौ।

Contents

Preface i - iii

1. Introduction - Pulastya in history and tradition 1
(1) Name
(2) Pulastya the sage
(3) Pulastya and his family
(4) Date and historicity
(5) Place
(6) Pulastya and Purāṇas
(7) Pulastya and Sāṅkhya
(8) Pulastya in Dharmaśāstra tradition.

2. The *Pulastyasmṛti* : the reconstructed text 25
(1) Sources
(2) Survival of text
(3) Problems of reconstruction
(4) Nature of the text : Dharmasūtra or Smṛti
(5) Two works of Pulastya
(6) Reconstruction of the text : its contents.

3. (A) The date of the *Pulastyasmṛti* 47
(1) Kane's view
(2) The recognition of Pulastya as a Smṛti writer
(3) Pulastya's contemporaries
(4) *Tīrthayātrāparva* and *Pulastyasmṛti*
(5) *Padmapurāṇa* and *Pulastyasmṛti*
(6) Internal evidence-
(i) Development of Dharmaśāstra literature
(ii) Kṛṣṇājinadāna
(iii) Week-day
(iv) Fourfold classification of sannyāsins
(v) Religious condition : Vaiṣṇavism and religious eclecticism; Gaṅgā and Tīrthas, Pāṣaṇḍins or Buddhists.

(B) Importance of *Pulastyasmṛti* 69

4. **The *Pulastya-upasmṛti*** 78

(1) Contents

(2) Comparison with *Bhaviṣya- purāṇa* and *Agnipurāṇa*

(3) Date

(4) *Pulastya-upasmṛti* distinct from *Pulastyasmṛti*

(5) Importance of the *Pulastya- upasmṛti* :

(a) Fivefold *dharma*

(b) Authority of the Smṛtis

(c) Smārtadharma as theme.

5. **Text of *Pulastyasmṛti* (Reconstructed)** 96

6. **Text of *Pulastya-upasmṛti*** 119

7. **Appendix :** 124

IA- Pulastya on Parvatadāna

IB- Pulastya on Pañcadhenudāna

IIA- Pulastya on Viśvavrata

IIB- Pulastya on Lakṣmīnārāyaṇavrata

IIC- Pulastya on Ghṛtasnānavrata

III- Pulastya on Tīrthayātrā.

8. **Sanskrit texts consulted** 151

Preface

The Dharmaśāstra literature is voluminous and is rich in significant information. But, it has not received proper attention from historians studying social life. It is, no doubt, normative in character, but normative writings are not without relevance for reconstructing the past. They are rooted in the realities of contemporary social life and condition its shape and future course.

The apathy towards the Dharmaśāstra literature resulted from the nature of its exposure to the enthusiastic British scholars and administrators during the times of the East India Company. They took a few Smṛtis, commentaries and digests to represent the socio-legal texts of India. They could not apprehend the nature of this literature, its vastness and the varied dimensions of its scope.

The earlier Smṛtis, of Manu and Yājñavalkya in particular, dwarfed the other Smṛti texts. Some of these had a limited span of coverage of topics and, thus, had a restricted applicability. Modern scholarship harbours the notion that the Smṛti texts envisage a social system, structure and point of view which is set and standardised, leaving little scope for deviations. The individual Smṛtis cannot be expected to record major variations of facts and changes of views. The varying factors of the author, his time and his place, thus, become of not much consequence.

Some of these Smṛtis blacked out in course of centuries. They are no longer available in their original form, and have survived as fragmentary quotations scattered in the very rich medieval Nibandhas, but only a small number of Nibandha texts have acquired a printed form. This has prevented a total evaluation of the Smṛti texts and their bearing on various problems of social life and institutions. The quotations indicate that the number of these texts was by no means small. A systematic collation of the quotations is expected to give some inkling of the nature of these texts and their significant views.

The Nibandha works very forcefully demonstrate that the prevailing assumption of the Smṛtis subscribing to a monotonously uniform and rigid set of provisions or views is not valid. Individual variations in respect of not only minor points but also major issues can be discerned in these quotations. Sometimes we find the minor Smṛtis effectively going against the established views of recognised Smṛtis.

The reconstruction of the Smṛtis out of the surviving quotations is expected to provide several fresh and useful texts for social history, which may throw light on the contours of social change, even if they are not as bold and prominent as we wish them to be.

The desirability of this type of research was felt long back, but very few systematic efforts could materialise. The reconstruction of the Smṛtis attributed to Śaṅkha-Likhita, Hārīta, Vyāsa and Kātyāyana had a limited scope of topics and concentrated on the few works available then. It was only in the case of the *Bṛhaspatismṛti* that K.V.R. Aiyangar attempted a model exercise. Kane's attempt in regard to the *Kātyāyana smṛti* threw up an equally imitable model, even though it was confined to the verses on *vyavahāra* .

In the course of our studies on Pulastya as a Dharmaśāstra writer we have identified two texts attributed to him. Of these the earlier one is not available in its original form, but has now been reconstructed by piecing together the available quotations. The other text, though published first in 1883, has remained ignored and could not be noticed even by Kane.

The first *Pulastyasmṛti* was a fuller text covering several aspects of the varied subject matter of Dharmaśāstra. Besides the treatment of the topics of *āhnika ācara, dāna, śuddhi, prāyaścitta* and *śraddha* appear to have been quite elaborate, Besides these the text had separate chapters on *devapūjā,* the special type of *krṛṣṇājina dāna,* purification on being bitten by animals, purification on contact with a *pāṣaṇḍin,* and the funeral rites for ascetics.

The second Smṛti, which we have named as the *Pulastya-upasmṛti,* is among the first to discuss the nature of Dharma treated in the Smṛtis, its five divisions, and the meaning and authority of the Smṛti injunctions.

The uncertainty about the precise date for the composition of the Smṛti texts generally has necessitated a discussion of all possible indications to reduce the time-brackets for the two texts. The desirability of a detailed and minute probing has been accentuated by the wild views recently floated on slender, and often flimsy grounds, about the dates of the Smṛti texts. We have argued to place the *Pulastyasmṛti* in the time-bracket A.D. 300-500, preferably its later part A.D. 400-500. For the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* we have suggested the date A.D. 650-700.

The Smṛti texts in many cases have a clear appearance of being eponymous writings. Evidently they could not have been composed by the ancient sages and hoary personalities, whose names are prefixed to them, but who have been turned into mythological figures. The texts cannot be pushed back to the period traditionally assigned to their supposed authors. It is difficult to believe on historical grounds that Manu, Nārada, Bṛhaspati, Uśanas, Yama and others could have actually written the Smṛtis attributed to them. But, there must have been some cogent reasons for attributing the texts to them. In the present case we have attempted an exercise to remove the layers of mythology which obscure the historical personality of

Pulastya. The accounts in the Epics and the Purāṇas, when subjected to a judicious critical analysis, yield elements of the historical kernel. Pulastya has his claims to historicity. He made significant contributions to the Dharmaśāstra tradition. The Purāṇas assign him a place of honnour and he was accepted as a Sāṅkhya thinker of distinction.

We have added a number of appendices recording the views of Pulastya on several special *dānas* (Parvatadāna and Pañcadhenudāna) and *vratas* and also his introducing the cult of pilgrimage.

On this occasion of the completion of an endeavour, which we undertook thirty years back, and, whose progress had been dogged by various problems created by institutional situations, other academic commitments and personal requirements, we fondly remember moments, which have given us courage, and friends, who have inspired us to persist. Those whose help of various sorts have contributed to the finalisation of this research work include late Sri Gopal Ram Tripathi, Dr. M.C. Joshi, Dr. I.C.Vishwakarma and Dr. M. D. Dubey. Sri Ullas Sharma of the Rishi Publications has succeeded in overcoming our hesitations about an early publication of the monograph.

9, Gurudham Colony,
Varanasi-221010.
Śivarātri
March 2, 1992.

Krishna Kanti Gopal
Lallanji Gopal

Chapter 1

Introduction : Pulastya in History and Tradition

The Dharmaśāstra literature is very vast. Only a small part of it has been published. Much of it still remains in the form of manuscripts. Many early texts composed as Smṛtis have not survived and are known only through quotations in later works.

P.V.Kane, in his monumental *History of Dharmaśāstra*, has utilised all the available Dharmaśāstra writings, even if they happen to be in the form of manuscripts. On the basis of his vast study Kane has introduced many Smṛti texts, which are no longer available in their original shape. The Smṛtis listed in Volume 1 of his work include one under the name of Pulastya [1]. Kane has pointed out a few quotations from Pulastya occurring in medieval commentaries and digests. These quotations clearly show that in ancient times there was a Smṛti text under the name of Pulastya which dealt with several topics generally covered in a Smṛti.

1. Name

The name of the Smṛtikāra in all cases is given as Pulastya by the authors of the Nibandhas and the commentaries. The only exceptions are the *Ācārendu* [2] and *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* [3] which mention the name of Paulastya. We cannot attribute the verses in question to another author different from Pulastya. That these quotations also were taken from the *Pulastyasmṛti* is indicated by the fact that the *Nṛsiṃhīya-prayoga-pārijāta* [4] attributes to Pulastya the verses which the *Ācārendu* ascribes to Paulastya. As all other authorities take the name to be Pulastya, the form Paulastya is evidently a mistake. It is, however, not unlikely that the authors of the *Ācārendu* and *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* possibly did not consider the ancient sage Pulastya to be the author of the Smṛti. They took it to be the composition of a person who belonged to the lineage of Pulastya and hence named him as Paulastya.

Tradition records the name of Pulaha also as a sage. Linguistically Pulastya can be transformed into Pulaha. But, the two are not to be mixed up. Tradition mentions them as two different persons, and, in many cases, they are referred to together in the same context. Manu [5] includes both Pulastya and Pulaha in the list of the ten Prajāpatis. In the *Mahābhārata* their names appear together at many places [6], among the mental progenies of Brahmā, the six powerful *maharṣis*, the seven *citra-śikhaṇḍi-ṛṣis*, the eight *prakṛtis* and the twenty-one Prajāpatis. Both are said to have been present in Indra's assembly and as sitting in Brahmā's assembly to worship him. Both attended the birth celebrations of Arjuna and Skanda, both went to the *rākṣasa-satra* of Parāśara, and both approached Bhīṣma when he was to leave his body. The difference between the two is clearly brought out by the other details associated with them. In the Dharmaśāstra tradition also they are mentioned as two different Dharmaśāstra writers. The list of twenty-one other Smṛtikāras, occurring in the *Prayogapārijāta*,[7] contains the names of both Pulastya and Pulaha.

The Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition gives a very interesting account of the role of Pulastya in Indian history. His personality is a strange mixture of mythical elements and historical facts.

2. Pulastya the sage

Pulastya is included in a list of eight *ṛṣis* revered as mind-born sons of Brahmā [8]. The Brāhmaṇa families are said to have descended from these *ṛṣis*. A further element of myth is introduced in the narrative of these sages by saying that Pulastya, Pulaha and Kratu, among the mind-born sages, did not found true Brāhmaṇa families. Their lines became extinct, but, because each of them adopted an Āgastya, their names were included in the Agastya *gotra* as three separate *pravaras*[9]. The Rākṣasas, Vānaras (monkey people), Kinnaras (bird people) and Yakṣas (supernatural beings) are mentioned as the offsprings of Pulastya [10]. Pulaha was the progenitor of Kiṃpuruṣas, Piśācas, goblins, lions, tigers and other animals. Kratu is generally described as a celibate, without any wife or child, but, in some accounts, the Vālakhilyas are mentioned as his offsprings.

In the Vedic literature we find references to seven priestly families or *vaṃśas* or *mūla-gotras* These seven oldest priestly

families were Bhārgavas, Āṅgirasas, Ātreyas, Kāśyapas, Vāsiṣṭhas, Āgastyas and Kauṣikas[11]. But the family of Pulastya is not included in the list of the Vedic families.

The fact that the name of Pulastya was included in the list of sages in the Itihāsa-Purāṇa texts shows that Pulastya received recognition in a later period. From the Vedic literature we do not get any details about his historical personality. This creates the impression that he was a creation of the later Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition.

John E. Mitchiner [12] has pointed out that there are two main lists of the seven *ṛṣis*. The first, found in the *Kalpasūtras*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata* and some of the Purāṇas, names the seven *ṛṣis* as Viśvāmitra, Jamadagni, Bharadvāja, Gautama, Atri, Vasiṣṭha and Kaśyapa. The second main list, as found in certain portions of the Epics and the Purānas, identifies them as Marīci, Atri, Aṅgiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu and Vasiṣṭha. According to Mitchiner, the formulation of the second list was the work of certain Brāhmaṇa *gotras* living to the south of the Vindhyas between c. 100 B.C. and A.D. 200. But, there is no definite evidence to confirm the role of the *gotras* and the specified region in the formulation of the list in the specified period[13].

The tradition reveres Pulastya as one of the ancient sages (*brahmarṣis*). His importance is indicated by the fact that he was considered to be one of the mind-born sons of Brahmā [14]. The *Mahābhārata* mentions his name in the lists of the mental progenies of Brahmā, the six *maharṣis*. the seven *citra-śikhaṇḍi ṛṣis*, the eight *prakṛtis* and twenty-one *prajāpatis*[15].

The *Mahābhārata* has different accounts of the mental sons of Brahmā in which their names and numbers vary [16]. We have references to their number being six [17] or nine [18]. But, usually they are stated to be seven in number [19]. According to Hopkins [20], six was the traditional number of the mental sons of Brahmā; the number was raised to eight to accord it with the eight number of *prakṛtis*. The number was raised to seven because the mental progenies were confused with the seven *ṛṣis*. [21]

The ṛṣis are said to belong to different categories in accordance with their status. There are *maharṣis*, *devarṣis*, *paramarṣis*, *rājarṣis* and *brahmarṣis*. On account of their prestige they were raised to the position of *devas* and *pitṛs* and, thus, came to acquire a semi-

mythical character. The process of the transformation of the *ṛṣis* into *pitṛs* can be discerned is some cases [22]. In the *Ṛgveda* [23] we find that there were many ancestors other than those who had a share in the *soma* drink. These seem to have formed the basis of the fourfold division of ancestors by Manu [24]. Manu mentions the progenies of Kavi, Aṅgiras, Pulastya and Vasiṣṭha as being respectively the *somapā, haviṣmat, ājyapā* and *sukālin* ancestors.

The position of Pulastya in the list of the mental progenies of Brahmā also used to change. Sometimes he is mentioned as third [25], but, in many cases, he is fourth [26]. The *Manusmṛti* [27] says that Brahmā divided himself into two halves, one male and the other female. From female he produced Virāj. Through austerities Virāj produced Svāyambhuva Manu. In his work of creation Svāyambhuva first produced ten *prajāpatis,* the great sages. Of these Pulastya was the fourth.

In the *Purāṇas* the mythical character of Pulastya was further emphasised. His name occurs in the list of the *prajāpatis*[28] and eight mental progenies [29] of Brahmā. A new element was added to the traditional account, when it was said that Pulastya came out of the ears of Brahmā [30]. The *Matsyapurāṇa*[31] has a story that many sons of Brahmā died as a result of the curse of Śaṅkara, Pulastya being one of them.

We, thus, see that Pusastya, a *brahmarṣi,* enjoyed a high respect. His prestige contributed to his recognition as a *pitṛ.* Tradition wove mythologies around his name and converted him into a mental progeny of Brahmā and later into one of the *prajāpatis.* Slowly his historical existence was completely obscured by the mythological coverings.

3. Pulastya and his family

The Itihsāsa-Purāṇa tradition has preserved varying and confusing accounts about Pulastya and his family. They are particularly confused about the position of his son Viśravas, the wives of the latter, and the progenies born to them[32].

Pulastya is said to have married Prīti, a daughter of Dakṣa. The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*[33] mentions Dānāgni, Devabāhu and Atri as her sons. But, in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* [34] we find the name of Dambholi (Agastya) as born of her. In the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* the name of

Pulastya's wife appears as Havirbhū whose sons were Agastya and Viśravas[35]. Yet another tradition in the Epics speaks of his marriage with Gau[36] or Ilavilā, the daughter of king Tṛṇabindu[37]. Vaiśravaṇa is mentioned as the son of Gau and Viśravas of Ilavilā[38]. Thus, in the case of both of his sons, Agastya and Viśravas, we have two conflicting traditions about the names of their mothers.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* [39] narrates the story of the marriage of Pulastya with the daughter of king Tṛṇabindu. Pulastya was performing penance in a hermitage which was frequented by *apsarases* and damsels on account of its natural beauty. Enraged by the constant disturbance, he put a curse that any woman, coming within his sight, will become pregnant at once, The princess[40], on entering the hermitage of the sage, came under the influence of the curse. When she reported her physical change to her father, he requested Pulastya to marry her. Pulastya did accordingly. According to the *Rāmāyana* Viśravas was the son of Pulastya from this wife and was known as Paulastya [41]. He married Devavarṇinī, the daughter of the great sage Bharadvāja. Vaiśravaṇa was the issue of this union[42].

The *Mahābhārata* tradition says that Vaiśravaṇa, Pulastya's son born of his wife Gau, deserted his father. He became lord of Rākṣasas and King of Kings in Laṅkā. Pulastya, to revenge himself upon Vaiśravaṇa, begot of himself another son Viśravas, who was the embodiment of half of Pulastya himself. Viśravas disliked Vaiśravaṇa, who, in order to win the favour of Viśravas, sent to him three women Puṣpotkaṭā, Mālinī and Rākā [43]. The names of the wives of Viśravas and their issues are mentioned differently in different sources. Thus, whereas Kaikasī and Puṣpotkaṭā are mentioned separately (see Bhargava), it has been pointed out that Kaikasī herself was known as Keśinī or Puṣpotkaṭā (see Walker). The name of Mālinī is dropped by some (Bhargava). All these wives of Viśravas belonged to the Rākṣasa families. Kaikasī is said to have been the daughter of the Rākṣasa chief Sumālin and his wife Ketumatī (Walker). But, according to another version (Bhargava), Kaikasī was the daughter of the Rākṣasa chief Mālin, and Puṣpotkaṭā and Rākā were the daughters of the Rākṣasa chief Sumālya. Besides Devavarṇinī, the *Rāmāyaṇa* mentions only Kaikasī as the wife of Viśravas. The text gives the family table of Kaikasī; Rākā, Puṣpotkaṭā and Kumbhīnasī were her sisters[44]. She was asked by

her father Sumālin to go and marry herself Viśravas, the son of Pulastya[45]. According to the *Mahābhārata*, Puṣpotkaṭā was the mother of Rāvaṇa and Kumbhakarṇa, Mālinī of Vibhīṣaṇa, and Rākā of the twins, Khara and Śūrpaṇakhā[46]. In the *Rāmāyaṇa*[47] Rāvaṇa (Daśagrīva), Kumbhakarṇa, Śūrpaṇakhā and Vibhīṣaṇa are said to have been born of Kaikasī. From Puṣpotkaṭā were born Mahodara, Prahasta, Mahāparśva, Khara and a daughter named Kumbhīnasī. Rākā was the mother of Triśiras, Dūṣaṇa, Vidyujjihva and a daughter named Asalikā[48].

We get some other names of the wives of Pulastya. The Piśitāśana or the flesh-eating ghouls are said to have been born of his wife Nikaṣā and hence were also known as Naikaṣeya or Nikaṣātmajas. Devavarṇinī is mentioned as another wife of Viśravas. She was the daughter of a certain Bṛhaspati, who seems to have been a Yakṣa. From her was born Kubera, the king of the Yakṣas, whose son was Nalakubera.

The *Matsyapurāṇa*[49] records a tradition that, as most of the progenies of Viśravas were of the Rākṣasa species, Pulastya adopted an Āgastya as his son.

The chronological confusion in the traditional account of Pulastya shows a vital difference about Kubera. In one tradition Vaiśravaṇa Kubera is mentioned as the son of Pulastya himself. Another tradition refers to him as the son of Viśravas, another son of Pulastya. Pulastya is said to have blessed Vaiśravaṇa, the son of Viśravas, to become the master of wealth.[50]

The Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition mentions many details about Pulastya which have an evidently mythological trait. Thus, in the *Mahābhārata* he is mentioned as being present in the palace of both Indra [51] and Brahmā.[52] He is also said to have been present at the investiture of Skanda [53].

There are some other details about Pulastya in the texts, but they are not of much help in determining his chronological position. He is said to have prevailed upon Parāśara to end his Rākṣasa sacrifice[54]. He is included in the list of people from whom Viśvāvasu, the Gandharva chief, is said to have received instructions in Sāṅkhya philosophy[55].

The *Mahābhārata* refers to Pulastya as being present on several occasions connected with events in the life of some of the important characters in the story of the Epic. He was present at the birth of Arjuna [56]. Nārada narrates to Yudhiṣṭhira how earlier, when Bhīṣma was young, Pulastya appeared and narrated to him the religious merit of visiting *tīrthas* [57]. Later, when Bhīṣma was lying wounded, Pulastya is mentioned as one of the *ṛṣis* who surrounded him[58]. But, it is to be noted that Pulastya does not play any direct and active part in the *Mahābhārata* story. He is only an ornamental figure adding to the grace of the occasion by his presence. It is as one of the hoary sages that he is mentioned on the occasion of the birth of Arjuna and in the death scene of Bhīṣma. It is, thus, clear that Pulastya could not have been contemporaneous with the main event in the *Mahābhārata* story. Even when he is mentioned in the context of the young days in the life of Bhīṣma, he does not have a historical nature. He has a supranatural character and appears before Bhīṣma to instruct him about the secret method of *tīrthayātrā* practised by the *ṛṣis*.

It is in the *Rāmāyaṇa* story that Pulastya is said to have had an active and direct participation in many events. The events of his life extend from the times of Tṛṇabindu to Rāma and Rāvaṇa. He marries the daughter of Tṛṇabindu[59]. He went to the hermitage of Budha when he was discussing the question of imparting manhood to Ila[60]. He blesses Vaiśravaṇa, the son of Viśravas [61]. He actively intervenes in two events concerning Rāvaṇa, another son of Viśravas. He was the mediator for settling the differences between Rāvaṇa and Māndhatā[62]. He is also said to have freed Rāvaṇa from Kārtavīrya Arjuna[63]. Later, he is said to have been present at the court of Rāma when Sītā swore[64].

4. Date and historicity

Pargiter [65] does not believe in the correctness of the references to Pulastya as a primeval *ṛṣi*. Attaching credence to the narrative which makes him a contemporary of Tṛṇabindu, he accepts the historicity of Pulastya.

The position of Tṛṇabindu is fixed. In the *Rāmāyaṇa*[66] he is described as a *rājarṣi*. The list of famous kings in the Epics and the Purāṇas includes Tṛṇabindu as one of the two renowned kings belonging to the Viśala kingdom.[67] From his queen Alambuṣā[68] he had a son Viśāla and a daughter Ilavilā who was married to Viśravas. The chronological position of Tṛṇabindu and Viśāla[69] can indicate the

date of Pulastya. They belonged to the Solar dynasty of Vaiśālī traced back to Nābhānediṣṭa, a son of Manu.[70] Bhalandana and Vatsapri are mentioned as the first two kings of the line. Marutta was one of the greatest kings of the dynasty, which has a regular list beginning with his son Nariṣyanta, whose son was Dama. Viśāla is said to have founded a city which came to be known as Viśālā or Vaiśālī [71] after him. The *Rāmāyaṇa*[72] mentions the names of the successors of Viśāla as Hemacandra, Sucandra, Dhūmrāśva, Sṛñjaya, Sahadeva, Kuśāśva, Somadatta, Kākutstha and Sumati. On the basis of the Puranic evidence Pargiter [73] gives the names of the last two kings as Janamejaya and Pramati. Sumati (or Pramati) was a contemporary of Daśaratha. Viśvāmitra, along with Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, on his way to Mithilā, is said to have halted for a night in Sumati's city and to have been received by him.[74] The synchronism of Sumati with Daśaratha and Rāma will imply that Pulastya, the contemporary of Tṛṇabindu and Viśāla, has to be placed during the reigns of Sarvakāma, Sudāsa or Mitrasaha-Kalmāṣapāda of the Ikṣvāku dynasty of Ayodhyā. Thus, there will be a gap of eight or nine generations between Rāvaṇa (and Daśaratha and Rāma) and Pulastya (and Tṛṇabindu and Viśāla).

P.L. Bhargava [75] tries to restore historical order in the accounts about Pulastya. According to him, Viśravas was not the son of Pulastya, but was eighth in descent from him. The argument is that as Rāvaṇa was a contemporary of Rāma and Daśaratha, his father Viśravas must have been a contemporary of Daśaratha's father Aja. Pulastya is known to have been a contemporary of Viśāla, the brother of Ilavilā, who founded the kingdom of Vaiśālī. Thus, there seems to have been a gap of several generations between Pulastya and Viśravas, and the latter could not have been the son of Pulastya.

There is nothing inherently improbable in Pulastya being active during the times of Viśravas, Vaiśravaṇa (Kubera) and Rāvaṇa. A person can be expected to be alive during the life time of his grand-sons. Pulastya could have actively participated in the events connected with Rāvaṇa.

But, the fact that Pulastya was a contemporary of Tṛṇabindu, the father of Ilavilā and Viśāla, will require us to explain the gap of eight generations, that separate Rāvaṇa and Rāma from Viśāla, to make all the references historically feasible. Either we reject the historicity of some of these references or else we postulate a gap, at some stage, either between Pulastya and Viśravas, or between Viśravas and his many progenies. Following P.L. Bhargava, it may be suggested that Viśravas was a later descendent of Pulastya, but was converted into a direct descendent by the tradition. Another possibility is that he was the son of Pulastya, but, in explaining the efflorescence and multiplication of the many branches of the descendents of Pulastya, the tradition made Viśravas father them all.

It is to be seen that Pulastya has a shadowy existence in the events concerning his grandsons. He blesses Vaiśravaṇa Kubera and prophesies about his greatness[76]. His role in pacifying the differences between Māndhātā and Rāvaṇa does not seem to have much historical basis, because the contemporaneity of the two principal characters is itself suspect [77]. In the episode concerning Kārtavīrya Arjuna Pulastya is said to have heard about the captivity of Rāvaṇa from the divine beings in the heaven[78] and to have reached Māhiṣmatī by the aerial route and flying at the speed of wind[79]. The reference to Pulastya repairing to the Brahmaloka after liberating Rāvaṇa from Kārtavīrya Arjuna[80] suggests that by that time Pulastya had come to acquire a mythological character.[81] His presence at the court of Rāma was not out of any historical necessity, but was the result of the traditional reputation of the sage. Thus, we would be inclined to attach greater historical authenticity to Pulastya's associations with Tṛṇabindu and his princess. He behaves like a real human being. He practises austerities, gets angry because of the disturbances, and marries the dauthter of a king.

But, we differ with P.L. Bhargava as regards the position of Viśravas in the family list. Viśravas does not play any significant role in the life of his many progenies. He remains a shadowy figure. Rāvaṇa is sometimes mentioned as a scion of Pulastya (*Paulastya-kulanandana*)[82], but the name of Viśravas does not occur in such casual references. Though reputed as a sage (*muni*), he does not perform any act in consonance with his character. Possibly his name was used as a cover to explain the many branches of Rākṣasa families and semi-mythological beings. The story of his creation by Pulastya from one half of his body [83] imparts him a semi-mythological character like that of his father Pulastya. To bring him nearer in time to Rāvaṇa and other *rākṣasas* the *Rāmāyaṇa* says that his first son

Vaiśravaṇa from his wife Devavarṇinī, the daughter of Bharadvāja, performed austerities for thousands of years which passed as they were really one year[84]. To account for the birth of the Rākṣasa chiefs from him the long line of Rākṣasas beginning with Heti, his son Vidyutkeśa, grandson Sukeśa and great-grandsons Mālyavān, Sumāli and Māli and their numerous progenies are listed[85]. The marriage of Viśravas with the daughter of Sumāli does not take place in the ordinary course. In a chapter, which has the appearance of a fresh and independent narrative, Sumāli, the *rākṣasa*, who came out from the nether land and was wandering on the earth, is said to have seen Dhaneśvara (Kubera Vaiśravaṇa) flying on the Puṣpaka to his father, the son of Pulastya. He asks his daughter Kaikasī to devote herself to the great sage Viśravas and to marry him. She approaches him and says that the sage can know her purpose through his spiritual knowledge. Viśravas knows her purpose and prophesies that she will give birth to cruel *rākṣasas* and a pious son as the youngest. It is clear from the account that, at the time of his marriage with Kaikasī, Viśravas was a very old man of legendary fame. We have to provide for years of his austerities, thousands of years of austerities of his son Vaiśravaṇa and latter's tenure as Kubera. The account gives a clear impression that unusual details have been imagined to provide for the marriage of Kaikasī with Viśravas, who belonged to a period long long before her own time, so that the birth of the many cruel *rākṣasas* is explained. Viśravas, referred to as Pulastya-*tanaya* and Paulastya, thus, seems to have been nearer in time to Pulastya, than to the later descendents of Pulastya. It may be suggested that tradition omitted several generations of insignificant descendents of Pulastya and traced the family tree as directly growing from his son Viśravas through his many wives.

According to the Puranic evidence Tṛṇabindu ruled in the beginning of the third quarter of the Tretā age[86]. Pargiter[87] shows that this suits other relevant chronological indications. Thus, Karandhama, the twelfth king preceding Tṛṇabindu in the Vaiśāla dynasty, is said to have reigned at the beginning of the Tretā age[88]. In his comparative chronological table Pargiter assigns Nos. 38 and 52 to Karandhama and Tṛṇabindu which practically agrees with the approximate limits assigned to that age by him.

We may, thus, place Pulastya eight generations before the times

of Rāvaṇa and Dāśarathi Rāma. The time gap between Pulastya and Rāma is indicated in the *Rāmāyaṇa*[89] when Pulastya is said to have belonged to the Kṛtayuga, a period much earlier than that of Rāma. There is a hotly contested controversy about the exact date of Rāma. The traditional evidence has been variously interpreted to suggest widely different dates. As this is not the direct task of our present study, we leave the discussion without deriving the final date on the basis of the Tṛṇabindu-Viśāla equation and its links with the times of Rāvaṇa and Rāma.

A natural question arises about the historicity of Pulastya. Our information about him is derived from the *Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*. In assessing the historicity of any name or event known from the Itihāsa-Purāṇa texts the general practice has been to seek epigraphic or numismatic confirmation. For periods, which do not yield any inscription or coin, corroboration in other texts is also considered to be a safe basis. For the early periods the Vedic literature can provide the only evidence of confirmation. Scholars generally take only those names and events to be historically authentic which have some allusion in the Vedic texts. The case of others, not covered by the Vedic texts, will always remain suspect.

Pulastya will appear to be a semi-historical figure on account of the absence of any direct or indirect reference to him in the early Vedic literature. The period, to which Pulastya is to be assigned, on the basis of the available references, will fall within the chronological span of the Vedic texts.

In support of Pulastya it may be submitted that he is evidenced not by one single text but by the entire Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata* and many *Purāṇas*. The Itihāsa-Purāṇa texts, no doubt, received their present form very late, not before the early centuries of the Christian era. But, the texts seem to have originated many centuries back. The Itihāsa-Purāṇa literature has an antiquity going back to the Vedic times. It is on account of the non-availability of an early text of the Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition that Pulastya appears to have emerged late in history and to have been a later creation. But, this is partially compensated by the fact that the Itihāsa-Purāṇa traditon has a respected antiquity and is known to have preserved much ancient material.

We may offer an excuse for the Vedic literature being silent about

Pulastya. As we have discussed below[90], Pulastya had connexions with the Sāṅkhya system. We know that there is some ancient evidence, accepted by some modern scholars, describing Sāṅkhya to be a-Vedic, if not completely anti-Vedic[91]. This may be one reason for the Vedic literature not taking cognisance of Pulastya and his socio-religious views. Another reason may be that the religious practices of *tīrtha-yātrā, dāna* and *vrata,* which Pulastya seems to have propagated, are characteristic of the Puranic religion as opposed to the Vedic practices. These Puranic practices appear to have been a later development. But, there are indications that they had an early origin. On the basis of the evidence, surviving in the Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition, Pulastya can be recognised as one of the early supporters of these Puranic rites. The Vedic circle could not have looked with approval on these new trends, and, hence, ignored Pulastya.

5. Place

Our sources do not contain any reference to the place to which Pulastya belonged. In Sri Lanka there exists an ancient city named Pulastinagara, but it could not have derived its name from its association with Pulastya. It is not unlikely that a later descendent of the royal family beginning with Vibhīṣaṇa established the city and, to reassert his connexions with the illustrious sage Pulastya, named it after him[92].

The locations of some of the descendents of Pulastya are mentioned in some sources [93]. Most of them are assoicated with south India and Laṅkā [94]. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* [95] Vaiśravaṇa, the son of Viśravas, on being appointed the fourth *lokapāla* and the Keeper of the Treasury, asked his father for a suitable place where he could settle. Viśravas advised him to settle in the city of Laṅkā, situated on the Trikūṭa mountain on the banks of the southern ocean. According to another tradition, Vaiśravaṇa, the son of Pulastya, rebelled against his father and then Prajāpati (Brahmā) appointed him *dhaneśa* and *lokapāla* and established him in Laṅkā [96]. The association of Viśravas with the *rākṣasas* can be an indication of his migrating to the south. Some passages connect Pulastya's *rākṣasa* descendents with the Himalayan region [97]. Kubera is also associated with Laṅkā in some passages of the two epics [98]; but his usual habitat is often

mentioned as the Himalayan region [99]. This could have been due to the traditional association of the *rākṣasas* with Laṅkā and of the gods (including Kubera) with the Himalayas. The habitation of the later Paulastyas need not be the original home of Pulastya.

According to a *Mahābhārata*[100] passage Pulastya's son Viśravas lived on the banks of the Narmadā. This would indicate an early stage in the march of the Paulastyas towards the south. The narrative about Pulastya's marriage with Tṛṇabindu's daughter will take him to the northern plains at an early stage of his career.

One possible indication can be sought in the account of the marriage of Pulastya with the daughter of Tṛṇabindu[101]. The place where Pulastya used to perform his penances was situated in the hermitage of Tṛṇabindu so that latter's daughter, while searching for her friend, reached the place. But, a closer analysis shows that the reference is not of much direct bearing on the problem. The hermitage of Tṛṇabindu is described as situated near the Meru mountain[102]. Tṛṇabindu had taken to asceticism. He is referred to as a *rājarṣi.* Meru cannot be located[103]. Moreover, it is not necessary for a king, renouncing worldly life, to establish his hermitage within his empire, though it can be expected to have been not far from it. Further, the reference says that Pulastya came to the place and settled in the hermitage for his penances. There is no indication about the place to which he originally belonged [103a].

Another clue to the home of Pulastya can be sought in the account of the Tīrthas which Pulastya narrated to Bhīṣma. It begins with Puṣkara and ends with Prayāga. Both the Tīrthas receive a detailed treatment and their religious merit is sung in several verses. The glorification of these places could have been, to some extent, influenced by the association of Pulastya with these places. But, this cannot be accepted as a compelling reason. Moreover, we cannot advance any argument in favour of either of the two places as being the actual home of Pulastya. Puṣkara is traditionally connected with Brahmā and Pulastya is remembered as one of his mental progenies. In favour of Prayāga it may be argued that the absence of any reference to Pulastya in the Vedic literature and his recognition by the Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition will favour a place in the mid-Gaṅgā valley. But, in the absence of any definitive clue we cannot locate the original home of Pulastya in more precise terms.

6. Pulastya and Puranas

Tradition associates Pulastya closely with the composition and handing down of the Puranic texts. The *Varāhapurāṇa*[104] records a tradition which gives him an important role in the history of the origin and circulation of the *Purāṇasaṃhitā*. Brahmā learnt the *Saṃhitā* from the Omniscient and handed it to his son Pulastya. Subsequently it passed through Bhārgava Rāma, Ugra and Manu. According to the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*[105], after Parāśara had stopped his *rākṣasa* sacrifice on the advice of his grandfather Vasiṣṭha, Pulastya blessed him to become the author of a summary of the Purāṇas. Parāśara is said to have narrated the Purāṇas as they were told to him earlier by Vasiṣṭha and Pulastya.

The association of Pulastya with the Purāṇas is further evidenced by the fact that he is closely connected with the transmission of the Puranic texts. Some of the Purāṇas are presented as an interlocution between Pulastya and another person. The *Nāradīyapurāṇa*[106] records that the Uttarabhāga of the *Varāhapurāṇa* was in the form of interlocution between Pulastya and king Kuru and dealt with the *māhātmya* of all the *tīrthas*, the *dharma* in its entirety, and Puṣkara. The extant *Varāhapurāṇa* also shows that in the original form of the text Pulastya spoke on *tīrthas* to Kururāja and the sages[107]. The extant *Vāmanapurāṇa* is in the form of a narration by Pulastya to Nārada. This characteristic of the *Vāmanapurāṇa* is noticed by the *Nāradīyapurāṇa*[108]. The *Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa* of the *Padmapurāṇa* is in the form of an interlocution between Bhīṣma and Pulastya. The introductory portion of the Purāṇa says that it was narrated by Brahmā to Pulastya, who, in his turn, recited it to Bhīṣma[109]. As directed by Brahmā, Pulastya approached Bhīṣma, who was living in Gaṅgādvāra,[110] and in reply to the various queries of the latter, recited the Purāṇa to him. It was possibly due to this tradition about Pulastya that Hemādri[111] quotes long verses on different types of *dānas* as uttered by Pulastya in the *Padmapurāṇa*. Likewise, the combined testimony of the *Smṛticandrikā* and the *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* shows that in the *Padmapurāṇa* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara* there were accounts of several *vratas* as expounded by Pulastya.[112]

7. Pulastya and Sāṅkhya

In the *Mahābhārata* the Śāntiparva mentions the name of Pulastya in a context which suggests his Sāṅkhya associations. Viśvavasu, the Gandharva king, approaches Yājñavalkya for the clarification of twenty-five questions. Yājñavalkya, in his reply, refers to the views of the followers of Sāṅkhya and Yoga. Viśvavasu, seeking further clarification about the nature of the twenty-fifth principle *(pañcaviṃśa)*, the soul, refers to Yājñavalkya's profound knowledge of Sāṅkhya and Yoga and says that earlier he himself received instruction from many people.[113] This list contains the names of Jaigiṣavya, Asita, Devala, Parāśara, Vārṣagaṇya, Bhṛgu, Pañcaśikha, Kapila, Śuka, Gautama, Ārṣtiṣeṇa, Garga, Nārada, Āsuri, Pulastya, Sanatkumāra, Śukra and Kaśyapa. Some of the names are known from other independent sources to have been renowned Sāṅkhya thinkers. Jaigiṣavya, Asita-Devala, Vārṣagaṇya, Pañcaśikha, Kapila and Āsuri played an important role in the formulation of Sāṅkhya principles. The inclusion of the name of Pulastya in this list is a clear proof that the tradition considered him also to have been a Sāṅkhya thinker.

We find glaring mythological elements in this traditioin. Besides the names mentioned above, it says that later on Viśvavasu received the philosophical knowledge from Rudra, Viśvarūpa, gods, *pitṛs* and *daiteyas* (demons). In the list there is a queer mixture of historical personages and legendary sages. As the names in the two categories are not clearly demarcated, we cannot be sure whether the author of the list intended Pulastya to have been a historical person. The order of the names does not respect any chronological sequence. Whereas Jaigiṣavya, Asita-Devala and Vārṣagaṇya are mentioned in the beginning, Pañcaśikha, Kapila and Āsuri appear later. Thus, we cannot hope to recontrust any chronological order in this list. On the basis of the list we cannot assign any date to Pulastya.

8. Pulastya in Dharmaśāstra Tradition

The Dharmaśāstra tradition, as recorded in the later Smṛtis and medieval Nibandha texts, preserves the memory of Pulastya as an expounder of *dharmaśāstra*. Even outside the Dharmaśāstra circles he enjoyed the reputation of an authority on Dharmaśāstra.

In the Tīrthayātrāparva of the Āraṇyakaparva of the

Mahābhārata he appears as the first to expound to Bhīṣma the practice of pilgrimage as a religious creed[114]. Arjuna's departure made Yudhiṣṭhira sad. To overcome his extremely sad mood and forget Arjuna Yudhiṣṭhira wanted to go somewhere else. In advising Yudhiṣṭhira to proceed on pilgrimage, Nārada narrates to him an earlier account of Bhīṣma meeting Pulastya. Pulastya had introduced this religious creed as a secret practice known only to the great sages. It is more efficacious in yielding religious merit than the performance of big sacrifices. It was meant for people who could not perform the sacrificial rites. A person visiting the *tīrthas* is required to perform certain religious acts at these places, to give gifts, or take a bath, or fast or perform a *yajña*. The religious merit of visiting the places and performing meritorious acts varied according to the importance of the place and the action performed. The different *tīrthas* had varying importance. Special sanctity was attached to the performance of a particular meritorious act at a particular *tīrtha*. A particular conjunction of various *nakṣatras* was considered specially auspicious for visiting a particular *tīrtha*. A person visiting a *tīrtha* was required to maintain a high standard of ethical conduct, to be pure in heart and to have faith.

The popularity of the *tīrthas* is indicated by the fact that even a desire to visit them is said to destroy the sins of a person. The ethical side of pilgrimage is underscored when it is said that all the sins of a person are destroyed by the mere act of bath at a holy *tīrtha* or by death at such a place.

The *Vāmanapurāṇa*, which is in the form of an interlocution between Pulastya and Nārada, contains passages relating to topics of dharmaśāstra. This Purāṇa consists mostly of *ākhyānas*, *stotras* and *vratas*. But, there are verses dealing with dharmaśāstra topics, for example, sinful acts leading to hell, *brahmacāridharma* and *sadācāra*, *bhojya* and *abhojya annas*, purification of objects, *śauca*, *sadācāra* for a *gṛhastha*, *varṇāśramadharma*, *punnāma* hell, twelve types of sons, *taptakṛcchra*, the *tīrthas* of Kurukṣetra, Sthāṇutīrtha and the *tīrthas* visited by Prahlāda[115]. These topics, however, are not dealt in separate chapters, but occur in the course of some *ākhyānas*. None of the verses in the *Pulastyasmṛti* can be traced in the *Vāmanapurāṇa*.

We have noticed earlier that the *Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa* of the

Padmapurāṇa is in the form of a narration by Pulastya to Bhīṣma. The account of its contents recorded in the *Nāradapurāṇa*[116] says that beginning with creation *(sṛṣṭi)* it expounds the details of *dharma* along with various *ākhyānas* and *itihāsa*. The account makes a pointed reference to the provisions about *dānas* and *vratas*, especially the *dhenudānas*.

The extant text of the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa does not differ from this summarised account. It does not aim at making provisions about the different aspects of *dharma*. There are narratives about *sṛṣṭi*, the *vaṃśas*, Brahmā, Śiva, Pārvatī, Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Nṛsiṃha, Vāmana, Gaṇeśa and Indra and some pious individuals. The provisions about different topics under *dharma* are emboxed in these narratives. In some cases the narratives are intended to illustrate these provisions. Besides the portions dealing with different *tīrthas* and *vratas*, we have accounts of several aspects of *dharma* scattered throughout the text. Some topics, for example, *brāhmaṇalakṣaṇa*[117], *āśramadharma*[118], *annadāna*[119] and *śrāddha*[120] are dealt at more than one place. Some of the dharmaśāstra topics, which are discussed in details, are *antyeṣṭi* (including *aśaucanirṇaya*) and *śrāddha* (including *ābhyudayikaśrāddha*, *ekoddiṣṭaśrāddha*, *nāndīśrāddha*, *sapiṇḍapitṛs*, proper place and time for *śrāddha*, duty of a person failing to perform *śrāddha*), *yugadharma*, origin of *varṇāśrama*, *āśramadharma*, Brāhmaṇas (including the *lakṣaṇas* of a Brāhmaṇa and an *adhama* Brāhmaṇa, regaining of Brāhmaṇahood, sin of torturing a Brāhmaṇa, *vṛtti* of a Brāhmaṇa, his *āpatkālikavṛtti*), *dānadharma* for a Sūdra, *sadācāra* (including serving the parents, *satya*, *nirlobha*, *dayā*, *santoṣa* and *ahiṃsā*), rules regarding women (including the *lakṣaṇas* of a *pativratā*, defects of a wicked woman, banning marriage with an *akulīna* woman, sins of *rajasvalāgamana* and *agamyāgamana*, *apātra vara*, *kanyādāna*, *anumaraṇa*, *vidhavādharma* and *dāsīdāna*), *āhnika ācāra*, *pañcavidha snāna*, Gaṅgā-*māhātmya*, Gāyatrī-*japa*, *jaladāna*, construction of reservoirs *(khātādi)*, planting of trees (especially Aśvattha), *prapā*, *dharmaghāṭadāna*, *setubandha*, constructing roads with stones, etc., *gopracāra* , constructing temples *(devaprāsāda)*, donation of lamps, etc., *vṛtti* of a *devalaka* Brāhmaṇa, worship of *svayambhū liṅga*, constructing *devamaṇḍapa*, building house for a *śrotriya*, providing *taṭāka*, *ārāma*, *kūpa*, *vāpī*, *sarovara*, etc., *annadāna*,

dhenudāna and *śailadāna*.[121]

As compared with the *Vāmanapurāṇa*, the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa of the *Padmapurāṇa* covers a wider range of the dharmaśāstra topics. Some of these topics are not found in the quotations from the *Pulastyasmṛti* that occur in medieval works. One can always take shelter under the explanation that passages from the relevant chapters have not been quoted in later texts. Even on points, covered by both the *Pulastyasmṛti* and the *Padmapurāṇa*, the provisions in the latter are more detailed. This cannot be explained as a case of the richer details dropping out in course of time. A comparision of the corresponding passages in the two texts does not show any significant parallelism in regard to the terms, expressions, passages and details of the provision. The possibility of one borrowing from the other does not arise.

We can suggest that the compiler of the *Padmapurāṇa* got the idea of presenting the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa in the form of an interlocution between Bhīṣma and Pulastya from the Āraṇyakaparva of the *Mahābhārata*. The wide coverage of the dharmaśāstra topics in the *Padmapurāṇa*, as against the account of only *tīrthayātrā* in the *Mahābhārata* chapters, would sugggest that by the time of the *Padmapurāṇa* the reputation of Pulastya as a Smṛti writer had been established.

We have referred[122] to passages which Hemādri quotes from the *Padmapurāṇa* as the utterances of Pulastya. These relate to various types of Meru (or *parvata*) *dānas* and *pañca-dhenudānas* The introductory verses,[123] quoted in connection with the *dhānya-parvatadāna* show that the original text intended to give a detailed account of various types of *dānas*. The introductory passage further indicates that the account was in the form of interlocution between Bhīṣma and Pulastya. Possibly it was believed that Pulastya, a dharmaśāstra writer, did not confine himself to *tīrthayātrā* but also expounded some other important topics, such as *dāna*, falling within the scope of dharmaśāstra.

As we have pointed out, the *Padmapurāṇa* has discussed *dāna* and its different types in many contexts. Chapter 21 of the *Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa* deals with ten types of *dhenudāna* and ten types of *śailadāna*. The account of the *dhenudāna* and *śailadāna* in the extant *Padmapurāṇa* and the *Padmapurāṇa* quotations recorded by

Hemādri are not the same. They show difference in structure, details and expressions. One cannot be said to be a summary or revision of the other. The question is : which of the two accounts is earlier and authentic. The very fact that Hemādri gives long and full provisions about different types of *dhenu* and *śaila dānas* is a reliable ground for postulating that the *Padmapurāṇa* text, as available to him, contained these passages. It is difficult to believe that Hemādri wrote these passages and foisted them on the *Padmapurāṇa*. The possibility of Hemādri mistakingly attributing to the *Padmapurāṇa* the account occurring in another source is equally not feasible.

The shorter version found in the extant *Padmapurāṇa* seems to have been inserted in the text at a later stage and to have gained currency in course of time. But, it must be admitted that we cannot determine when, where and by whom this was done. The reasons, which prompted this exercise of substituting a shorter version for the original account, are still more difficult to determine.

It is in the light of the *Padmapurāṇa* chapters on dharmaśāstra topics that we have to explain the passages which the *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* quotes from the *Padmapurāṇa* on the Viśvavrata and from the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* on the *Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa-vrata* and the *Ghṛtasnānavrata* The *Viṣṇudharmottara* verses on the *Ghṛtasnānavrata* occur earlier in the *Smṛticandrikā*. All these passages are introduced as the utterances of Pulastya [124]. The passages, however, cannot be traced in the extant *Padmapurāṇa* and *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*. But, in any case, they do confirm the prestige of Pulastya as an expounder of dharmaśāstra. Whether these passages also appeared as part of an interlocution between Bhīṣma and Pulastya cannot be confirmed on the basis of the available quotations. But, in any case, they suggest that as an expounder of *dharmaśāstra* Pulastya was credited by the tradition to have made provisions about Vratas and many important topics under Dharmaśāstra.

References

1. Vol. I, Pp. 516-17.
2. Page 4= Pulastya (our reconstruction) I . 1 . 1-2.
3. Page 222 = Pulastya II. 43.
4. Page 3.
5. I. 35.
6. S. V. Sorensen, *Index of Proper Names in the Mahābhārata, s. v. Pulastya* and *Pulaha.*
7. Quoted in *Vīramitrodaya, Paribhāṣāprakāśa*, p.18.
8. *Vāyupurāṇa*, 49. 68-69 .
9. *Matsyapurāṇa*, 202. 8-13; P. L. Bhargava, *India in the Vedic age*, P. 188.
10. *Mbh* ., III. 274. 12; I. 66. 7-9.
11. P. L. Bhargava, *Op. cit* ., Pp. 167-69.
12. *Traditions of the Seven Ṛṣis*, Delhi, 1982.
13. See Ram Gopal's review of the monograph in *The Indian Historical Review*, Vol. XI, Pp. 187-88.
14. *Mbh* . , I. 65.10; III. 274. 12.
15. S. V. Sorensen, *Op. cit* ., s. v. *Pulastya.*
16. Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, Pp. 189-90.
17. *Mbh* . , I. 66.4; 65. 10
18. *Ibid.*, III. 272. 45; XII. 340. 18; 346. 6.
19. *Ibid* ., XII. 207. 17; 208. 4; 327. 61.
20. *Op. cit.*, P. 190.
21. Mitchiner, *Op. cit.*, (Chapters 5-7) discusses the cultic, ascetic, political and family roots of the seven *ṛṣis* and their transference to the sky.
22. A. Hillebrandt, *Vedic Mythology* (Tr. S. Sarma), II, P.255.
23. X. 15. 8, 10; X. 154. 1.
24. III. 198.
25. *Mbh.*, XII. 166. 16.
26. *Mbh.*, I. 65. 10.; I. 66.4; XII. 207. 17; XII. 208. 4; *Rāma*, III. 14. 8.
27. I. 34-35.
28. *Matsya*, 171. 26-27; *Bhāgavata*, III. 12. 22.
29. *Vāyu*, 49. 68-69.
30. *Matsya*, III. 6-8; *Vāyu* 66.22; *Bhāgavata*, III. 12. 24.
31. Ch. 195.
32. Hopkins, *Op. cit.*, P. 41; B. Walker, *Hindu World*, II, P. 253; P. L. Bhargava, *Op. cit.*, P. 189.

33. II. 12 . 26-29.
34. I. 10.
35. *Bhāgavata*, IV. 1. 36.
36. *Mbh.*, III. 258. 12.
37. *Rāma*, VII. 2. 7-34 (it does not name the *tanayā* of the king).
38. *Mbh.*, III. 258. 12; *Rāma*, VII. 2. 30-35.
39. VII. 2.7-34.
40. The name of the daughter of Tṛṇabindu is not mentioned in this narrative in the *Rāmāyaṇa* .
41. *Rāma*, VII. 2. 30-33.
42. *Ibid* ., 3. 1-8.
43. *Mbh* ., III. 275. 5f.
44. *Rāma*, VII. 4. 14-VII. 5. 44. Of the two Rākṣasa chiefs, Heti and Praheti, Heti married Bhayā and had a son Vidyutkeśa. Vidyutkeśa married Sālakaṭaṅkaṭā, the daughter of Sandhyā. Their son Sukeśa married Devavatī, the daughter of a Gandharva named Grāmaṇi, and had three sons, Mālyavān, Sumāli and Māli, who were married respectively with Sundarī, Ketumatī and Vasudā, the three daughters of Narmadā, a Gandharvī. The names of the sons and daughters of these three are given. Rākā, Puṣpotkaṭā, Kaikasī and Kumbhīnasī are mentioned as the daughters of Sumāli and Ketumatī.
45. *Ibid.*, 9. 6-16.
46. III. 275. 5f.
47. VII. 9. 27-35.
48. P. L. Bhargava, *Op. cit.*, P. 189.
49. 202. 12-13.
50. *Rāma*, VII. 3. 6-8.
51. *Mbh.*, II. 7. 17.
52. *Ibid* ., II. 11. 19.
53. *Mbh.*, IX. 45. 9.
54. *Mbh.*, I. 180. 9-22.
55. *Mbh.*, XII . 318. 61.
56. *Mbh.*, I. 122. 52.
57. *Mbh.*, III. 80. 11-29.
58. *Mbh.*, XII. 47. 10.
59. *Rāma*, VII. 2. 7-34.
60. *Ibid* VII. 90. 9.
61. *Ibid.* VII. 3. 6-8.
62. *Ibid* ., VII. 23. Interpolated Ch.3. 56-57.
63. *Ibid.*, VII. 33. 1-21.

64. *Ibid*., VII. 96. 3.
65. *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, P. 242.
66. VII. 2. 14, 23, 27.
67. Pargiter, *Op. cit*., Pp. 6-7.
68. *Garuḍapurāṇa,* I. 138. 11. Alambuṣā was the name of an Apsaras. It was not unusual to name women after Apsarases. Hence there was a possibility of a mistaken identification with the Apsaras, as done by *Viṣṇupurāṇa,* IV . 1. 18 and *Bhāgavata-purāṇa,* IX. 2. 31. This possibly led the *Rāmāyaṇa* to retain the name of Alambuṣā as the mother of Viśāla, but mention her as the wife of Ikṣvāku, the son of Manu Vaivasvata.
69. Pargiter, *Op. cit*., P. 147.
70. A Puranic tradition traces the dynasty to Dhṛṣṭa, the son of Ikṣvāku's brother Nabhāga. See Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India,* P. 108; R. C. Majumdar and A. D. Pusalker (Ed.), *The Vedic Age*, Pp. 279-80. The *Rāmāyaṇa* mentions Ikṣvāku himself as the father of Viśāla, omitting all the intervening names.
71. Vaiśālī, modern Basarh in Muzaffarpur, Bihar is situated on the banks of the Gandak, but the *Rāmāyaṇa* locates Viśālā, founded by Viśāla, on the banks of the Gaṅgā.
72. I. 47. 11-17.
73. *Op. cit*., P. 147.
74. *Rāma*, I. 47. 17-I.48.9.
75. *Op. cit*., Pp. 188-89.
76. *Rāma,* VII. 3. 6-8.
77. The account appears in one of the interpolated chapters after *Rāma*, VII. 23.
78. *Rāma*, VII. 33. 1.
79. *Ibid*., 3.
80. *Ibid*., 20.
81. Pargiter, *Op.cit*., P. 242, f.n. 5 objects to the historicity of the narrative and points out that Kārtavīrya was much earlier than Tṛṇabindu. According to him, Rāvaṇa is not a personal name, it is a Sanskritized form of a Tamil word and may refer to the capture of a Dravidian king by Kārtavīrya. In support of his suggestion that Pulastya was introduced in the narrative later he points out that the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (IV. 11. 6) is silent about Pulastya.
82. *Rāma,* III. 32. 23; VII. 12. 15. *(Paulastya-tanaya)*; VII. 20. 16 *(Paulastya)*.

83. *Mbh*., III. 274. 13-14.
84. VII. 3. 11-13- एवं वर्षसहस्राणि जग्मुस्तान्येकवर्षवत् ।
85. *Ibid*., VII. 4-5.
86. *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, III. 8. 36-37; 61.10-11; *Vāyupurāṇa*, 70. 31; 86. 15.
87. *Op. cit*., P. 178.
88. *Vāyupurāṇa*, 86. 7.
89. VII. 2. 4 - पुरा कृतयुगे राम प्रजापतिसुतः प्रभुः ।
पुलस्त्यो नाम ब्रह्मर्षिः साक्षादिव पितामहः ॥
90. See *infra* section I. 7.
91. A. P. Mishra, *Sāṅkhya-darśana kā Itihāsa*, Pp. 8-14.
92. P. L. Bhargava, *Op. cit*., P. 189, f.n. 1.
93. *Ibid*., P. 242.
94. *Rāma,* VII. 3. 29; 4. 1ff, 11-13; 8. 19-24.
95. VII. 3. 22-36.
96. *Mbh*., III. 258. 13, 15-17.
97. *Mbh*., III. 259. 33; V. 110. 3; *Rāma,* III. 32. 14-16.
98. *Rāma,* VII. 8. 29; *Mbh*., III. 258. 16; 259. 32.
99. *Rāma,* VII. 110. 34-52; 25. 52. *(Kailāśa śaila)*; *Mbh*., III. 258. 17 *(Yakṣāṇāmādhipatyam)*; 259. 33 *(Gandhamādanam)*.
100. III. 87. 2-3.
101. *Rāma*, VII. 2. 4-38.
102. *Ibid*., VII. 2. 7.
103. Meru is a fabulous mountain in Hindu mythology. It is "said to form the central point of Jambūdvīpa; all the planets revolve round it and it is compared to the cup or seed-vessel of a lotus, the leaves of which are formed by the different Dvīpas.., the river Ganges falls from heaven on its summit and flows thence to the surrounding world in four streams; the regents of the four quarters of the compass occupy the corresponding faces of the mountain, the whole of which consists of gold and gems; its summit is the residence of Brahmā and a place of meeting for the gods, Ṛishis, Gandharvas &c; when not regarded as a fabulous mountain, it appears to mean the highland of Tartary north of the Himālaya"- M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit- English Dictionary* s.v. *Meru,* p. 833, column. 2. Meru is very widely referred to in Sanskrit literature. It is described in the *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas. Al-Bīrūnī tries to investigate the rational basis of the accounts of Meru given by Brahmagupta, Balabhadra and Āryabhaṭa and the Purāṇas—E. Sachau, *Alberuni's India,* Vol. I, Pp. 243-50. At

best we can take the reference to suggest the Himalayan region.

103a. In the *Mahābhārata* (XII. 47. 9) he visits Bhīṣma as he lies on the bed of arrows. In another passage the Pāṇḍavas, when living in the Kāmyakavana with the permission of Tṛṇabindu, keep Draupudī in the hermitage before going for hunting- *Ibid*., III. 248. 5. But this is an abrupt reference; the earlier passages do not mention Tṛṇabindu. In III. 242. 13 the Kāmyakavana is described as situated at the apex of the desert, near the Tṛṇabindu lake. The *Mahābhārata* evidence will suggest that Tṛṇabindu lived near Kurukṣetra, on the borders of the Rajasthan desert.

104. CXII. 64ff.
105. I. 1. 13-27.
106. I. 103. 13-14a.
107. CCXVII. 1-6.
108. I. 105. 17.
109. *Padma*, Sṛṣṭi, 2. 47.
110. *Ibid*., 61-68.
111. *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, Pp. 346-84. Also *Vidhānapārijāta* Pp.139-47. See *infra* Appendix I.
112. See *Infra* Appendix II-A, B, C.
113. *Mbh.*, XII. 318. 59-63.
114. *Mbh.*, III. 80. 29ff. See Dhairyabala P. Vora, *Evolution of Morals in the Epics*, Pp. 244-46.
115. R. C. Hazra, *Studies in Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, P. 179 lists Chapters 11, 12, 14, 80, and 95 as Smṛti chapters.
116. I. 93.
117. Chs. 13, 15, 48.
118. Chs. 13, 15.
119. Chs. 19, 37.
120. Chs. 9-11, 52.
121. Chs. 9-11, 13, 15, 19-21, 23, 27, 28, 37, 48-55, 59-62, 64, 86.
122. See *supra* section I. 6.
123 See Appendix I-A, verse 1.
124. See Appendix II- A, B, C.

Chapter 2

The Pulastyasmṛti : The Reconstructed Text

1. Sources

The medieval texts[1] which quote from Pulastya are: Viśvarūpa's commentary on Yājñavalkya (first quarter of the 9th century A. D.), Vijñāneśvara's *Mitākṣarā* (A.D.1100-1120), Aparārka on Yājñavalkya (c.A.D. 1125), Ballālasena's *Dānasāgara* (A.D. 1168-69), Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa's *Smṛticandrikā* (c.A.D. 1150-1225), Hemādri's *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* (A.D. 1260-1270), Caṇḍeśvara's *Dānaratnākara* (c.A.D. 1314-1324), Mādhava's *Kālanirṇaya* (also called *Kālamādhava*) (A.D. 1335-1360), *Laghumādhava* or *Kālamādhavakārikā*, Nṛsiṃha's *Prayogapārijāta* (A.D. 1360-1435), Vācaspatimiśra's *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* (later half of the 15th century), Gadādhara's *Gadādharapaddhati* (*Ācārasāra*) (c.A.D. 1450-1500), Allāḍanāthasūri's *Nirṇayāmṛta* (later than A.D. 1250 but earlier than A.D. 1500), Raghunandana's *Smṛtitattva* (A.D. 1510-1580), Nandapaṇḍita's *Śrāddhakalpalatā* (A.D.1584-85), Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa's *Dharmadvaitanirṇaya* (c.A.D. 1580-1600), Vaidyanāthadīkṣita's *Smṛtimuktāphala* (c.A.D. 1600) Rāmadaivajña's *Muhūrtacintāmaṇi* (A.D.1600-1), Kamalākarabhaṭṭa's *Nirṇayasindhu* (A.D.1612), Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa's *Kālatattvavivecana* (A.D. 1620), Anantabhaṭṭa's *Vidhānapārijāta* (A.D. 1625), Bhaṭṭa Nīlakaṇṭha's *Ācāramayūkha* and *Prāyaściitamayūkha* (A.D. 1610-1645), Mitramiśra's *Vīramitrodaya* (first half of the 17th century), Viśvambhara Trivedin's *Smṛtisāroddhāra* or *Cakranārāyaṇīyanibandha* (first half of the 17th century), Anantadeva's *Saṃskārakaustubha* or *Saṃskāradidhiti* (third quarter of the 17th century), Ratnākara's *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* (A.D.1713), Gopīnātha Dīkṣita's *Saṃskāraratnamālā* (A.D.1765), Viṣṇubhaṭṭa Āṭhavale's *Puruṣārthacintāmaṇi* (A.D.1784-85), *Bālambhaṭṭī* on *Mitākṣarā* (c.A.D. 1730-1820), Bapubhaṭṭa Kelakara's *Śrāddhamañjarī*

(A.D. 1810), Tryambaka Ram Oka's *Ācārabhūṣaṇa* (A.D. 1819), Trayambaka Māṭe's *Ācārendu* (A.D. 1838), *Dharmapradīpa* and *Prāyaścittapradīpa* of Kṛṣṇamitra[1a] , *Kalyāpaddharmasarvasva,* and *Śuklayajuḥśākhīya Karmakāṇḍapradīpa.*

2. Survival of the text

We find that some medieval texts quote some verses not directly from the *Pulastyasmṛti* but from an earlier secondary source. Thus, the *Puruṣārthacintāmaṇi* quotes two verses of Pulastya[2] as occurring in Hemādri and one[3] in Mādhava. Likewise, the *Nirṇayasindhu* admits taking three verses of Pulastya from three earlier writings, one each from Aparārka[4] Hemādri [5] and *Madanāratna*[6]. The *Nṛsiṃhīyaprayogapārijāta* takes a set of two verses of Pulastya[7] from Hemādri. The *Ācārendu* also admits taking these verses from Hemādri, but in the case of one line of a verse[8] mentions the *Ācārasāra* as its source. The *Dharmadvaitanirṇaya* quotes one Pulastya verse[9] from Hemādri. The *Śuklayajuḥśākhīya Karmakāṇḍapradīpa* derives three lines of Pulastya[10] from the *Ācāramayūkha.* The *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* quotes one Pulastya verse[11] from the *Pṛthvīcandrodaya*. In the *Ācārabhūṣaṇa* one Pulastya line [12] is quoted from *Ācārasāra.*

Of the various texts, which quote Pulastya verses not directly from the *Pulastyasmṛti* but from some earlier secondary work, some are found strangely mentioning Pulastya as the direct source in the case of some other quotations. Thus, we find that the *Ācārendu* [13], *Ācārabhūṣaṇa* [14] and the *Śuklayajuḥśākhīya Karmakāṇḍapradīpa*[15] reproduce two verses, *Nirṇayasindhu* eight passage,[16] *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* one verse,[17] *Puruṣārtha-cintāmaṇi* three lines[18] and *Nṛsiṃhīyaprayogapārijāta* three verses[19] directly from Pulastya.

The *Prayogapārijāta* (A.D. 1360-1435) is among the earliest to quote Pulastya from an earlier secondary source. The secondary sources, largely drawn upon for Pulastya quotations, are Aparārka and Hemādri. Pulastya's verses are also quoted on the authority of the *Madanaratna,* the *Ācārasāra* (of Mādhava, the *Madanaratna,* the *Gadādharapaddhati),* the *Pṛthvīcandrodaya* and the *Ācāramayūkha.* Of these the *Pṛthvīcandrodaya* is not available presently, but is used by the *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* and earlier by

Hemādri, Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa, Kamalākarabhaṭṭa and Anantabhaṭṭa [20]. The *Madanaratna,* also known as the *Madanaratnapradīpa* or *Madanapradīpa,* seems to have been compiled by Viśvanātha [21] under the patronage of a certain king Madanasimhadeva around the date A.D. 1400-1450[22]

There can be two explanations of the facts. One possibility is that a text of the *Pulastyasmṛti* had come down to later times, but, some passages, which originally occurred in the text, had dropped in course of centuries, and, hence, they were reproduced only on the basis of an earlier secondary source. But, there is a serious difficulty in accepting this explanation. We find that the same verse is quoted directly from Pulastya by a few later texts, whereas some others mention an earlier secondary text as the source. [23] This would mean that passages from the *Pulastyasmṛti* have been dropping from it at intervals in different periods. It would further require us to accept the ridiculous possibility of a passage dropping at one stage to reappear in the text at a later stage.

Another more likely explanation can be that though the text in its full original form was available upto a certain period, it went out of general circulation after that. It is not unlikely that in some particular quarters a copy of the text survived for some more time, but was lost later on. The text seems to have been widely available upto the fourteenth century, and in some quarters, upto the seventeenth century, but seems not to have been in easy circulation in all areas from the fifteenth century. If the text still exists in some unknown collection, we cannot confirm its existence. The catalogues compiled so far do not list the text. We cannot rule out the possibility, howsoever remote, that a copy of this Smṛti, as in the case of some other texts, survives to be recovered as a chance discovery on some happy date later.

3. Problems of reconstruction

A serious difficulty, which a researcher, reconstructing a lost Smṛti, has to face, is the absence of a standard formulation of the contents of a Smṛti text. Modern authorities, such as P.V.Kane, J.R. Gharpure and K.V.R. Aiyangar, have analysed all the topics that are covered by the name Dharmaśāstra or Smṛti. But, it can easily be seen that they have taken into account the wide scope of the terms as

they developed in course of centuries and as they came to be accepted by Nibandha writers. We do not have a single original Smṛti planned according to the requirements of the full scope and contents of Dharmaśāstra. The ancient Smṛtis, under the names of Manu, Yājnavalkya, Nārada and Parāśara, do not conform to this listing of topics. They show wide variation in the choice of topics, the emphasis given to them, and the order in which they are presented.

The situation is illustrated best by the minor Smṛtis. They do not exhaust all the topics falling under the scope of Dharmaśāstra. Some of them totally ignore some impotant parts of the socio-religious system associated with the Dharmaśāstras. In some cases we find them confining themselves to one or some of these topics.

We can get an idea of the nature and dimensions of the problem when we analyse the reconstruction of the Smṛtis attempted so far. Whereas in the case of the earlier Smṛtis, Bṛhaspati[24] and Kātyāyana,[25] the treatment seems to have been detailed and exhaustive in covering the topics, the surviving passages do not indicate a parallel situation in the case of other Smṛtis, such as that of Vyāsa.[26]

Our reconstruction has naturally to be conditioned by the availability of the passages which have survived. Later writers naturally quoted passages relevant to the topics on which they wanted to lay down provisions. No doubt, with a view to making their discussion exhaustive, they noted diverse views on any point; but, they cannot be criticised for a natural tendency to give more space to passages which were in support of their own views. Likewise, if they preferred to quote better known and more important authorities and did not reproduce passages from all the lesser known and minor Smṛtis, it was a choice dictated by the demands of limited space. In selecting quotations from any Smṛti they cared for those passages which seemed to represent their significant views and were without much parallel in other Smṛtis.

The available quotations can at best reveal only a small fraction of the icaberg of any Smṛti. The Nibandha writers were under no obligation to indicate the outlines of the structure of the Smṛtis drawn upon. They did not quote uniformly from all the chapters of a Smṛti. It is quite likely that in the process they omitted completely its many chapters. Even in the case of chapters, from which they have actually

quoted, they were not required to reproduce representative passages to indicate the contents. They selected only quotable quotes.

Thus, in the existing situation we cannot expect to get indications of all the chapters of a Smṛti. It is quite likely that some chapters will always remain unknown to us. In the case of the chapters represented by the quotations we get an idea of their total content only when the entire chapter has been reproduced.

The surviving quotations in the present case do not help us in reconstructing the structure of the original Smṛti. They reproduce the passages without indicating their association with the chapters in the *Pulastyasmṛti*. It must be emphasised that the occurrence of a particular passage in a discussion about any topic in the Nibandha texts or commentaries is not always a safe indication that in the original *Pulastyasmṛti* also it appeared in the same context. A particular passage in the *Pulastyasmṛti* has been quoted by later texts in several contexts to indicate or corroborate certain provisions[27]. It is the relevance of that passage to the details of any one or many topics, as discussed in the later Dharmaśāstra writings, that made their authors reproduce the passage. A careful analysis of the passage and its comparision and correlation with other passages do indicate the context in which it occurred in the original text.

The quotations do not mention the headings of the different chapters. Some of the medieval sources do contain a reference to the context in which the passage occurred. They point out the topic discussed in the original Smṛti from which the quotation is taken [28]. But, it can be seen, in some cases at least, that the passage could not possibly have formed part of a chapter dealing with that topic [29]. The medieval writers mention the topic for which they are using the testimony of the passage quoted by them and thus indicate the point for which they consider the passage to be relevant.

In some of the extant minor Smṛtis we find that a full chapter has been devoted to a point which seems to be of minor significance among the topics that are covered by Dharmaśāstra. This could have been on account of the interest of its author in that particular topic. The topic possibly had assumed a greater importance in his times. This special significance could have resulted from the relevance of the topic for the region or socio-religious group to which the author belonged.

One extract from the *Pulastyasmṛti* [30] begins with the introductory sentence : Athātaḥ kṛṣṇājinadānavidhiṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ. This is exactly the formula adopted in many Smṛtis at the beginning of a chapter. This would suggest that the *Pulastyasmṛti* contained a separate chapter entitled *Kṛṣṇājinadāna*. On this analogy we can speculate that some other chapters also had a parallel introductory sentence. But, in the absence of actual sentences in other cases we cannot speculate a uniform applicability of this style to all the chapters of the original Smṛti. We find that some other Smṛtis have such introductory sentences only in some of their chapters and not in all.

We do not know the style of presentation adopted by the author, how a topic was introduced, how it was classified into sub-points, and the extent to which its various aspects were covered. It is only in the case of the chapter on *Kṛṣṇājinadāna* that we have the whole of it quoted. The passage mentions the occasion for making the gift and the specific nature of the black deer's skin to be gifted. It gives full details of the procedure. The ground is to be smeared with cowdung. Kuśa grass is to be spread over it and then it is to be covered with a woollen cloth. The deer's skin is to be placed on it. Its full form is to be reconstructed by placing sesamum on it and it is to be covered with two pieces of cloth. On the four sides four pots of copper, silver, bronze and gold are to be placed with Kṣīra in the eastern pot, curd in the southern one, ghee in the western one, and honey in the northern one. On each side a cow, which has calved for the first time, is to be placed. On the western side fire is to be ignited to the accompaniment of *mahāvyāhṛtis,* and sesamum soaked in ghee is to be offered. A learned Brāhmaṇa, covered with two pieces of cloth and bedecked with ornaments, is to be given the deer's skin. The sentence, which the donor is to utter at the time of making the gift, and the replying sentence, which the donor is to utter while receiving it, are also mentioned. Verses or passages, eulogising the merit of the gift, are not recorded. We do not know if they were omitted by Hemādri. Possibly they did not occur in the original Smṛti itself. As indicated by the introductory sentence, the scope of the 'chapter was limited to the details of the procedure (*vidhi*) of the *dāna*. It may be surmised that, if there were some other chapters of a parallel nature, the author adopted a similar style of presentation for

them.

In the *Pulastyasmṛti* III. 1 the last word in the second line is *dvijottamāḥ*. J. R. Gharpure [31] takes the reading to be *dvijottama* and translates it as "O best of the twice-born". If the expression is treated as being in the vocative case, then it will have an important bearing on the form and structure of the original *Pulastyasmṛti*. It would imply that the text was in the form of an interlocution in which the main speaker, possibly Pulastya himself, addressed his ordinances to a person, who was most likely a Brāhmaṇa. But, there is no need for taking the expression to be in the vocative case. No doubt, the first line has *gṛhī* in the nominative case, but that does not prevent another word in the second line also being in that case. In Sanskrit literature it is quite fashionable to have the noun in the nominative case in one line and to retain its qualifying word in the nominative case in the second line.

4. Nature of the text : Dharmaśāstra or Smṛti

Before attempting a reconstruction of the text, associated with the name of Pulastya, we have to decide its nature, whether it was a Dharmasūtra or a Smṛti. Kane [32] has noted a prose passage from Pulastya which deals with the procedure about the gift of black deer's skin (*kṛṣṇājinavidhi*). This passage occurs in the *Dānaratnākara*[33] of Caṇḍeśvara. The section on the gift of black deer's skin was considered to be a significant one in the text ascribed to Pulastya. The *Dānasāgara*[34] of Ballālasena quotes an aphorism from this very section in Pulastya's text. Hemādri, in his *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*[35], reproduces the full section, which contains both these passages. Another prose quotation from Pulastya is again an aphorism about the performance of Sandhyā in the Gaṅga and occurs in the *Tīrthacintāmaṇi*[36].

The prose passages do not seem to have a stray existence in the original text composed by Pulastya. The introductory line in the quotation, recorded in the *Dānaratnākara* and the Dānakhaṇḍa of the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* makes it clear that there was possibly a full chapter (or at least a specific section of a chapter) on the procedure for making a gift of black deer's skin, which was not in verses. The full quotation in the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* shows that

the text did not contain succint *sūtras* in the style of the Dharmasūtras. The prose passages contained the full account with all the details of the procedure of the *dāna* spelt out. If we postulate a similar treatment of some other topics, prose passages will seem to have occupied considerable space in the text named after Pulastya.

Here a natural question arises : did all these passages, prose and verses alike, form part of one single text ? A possible explanation can be that there were two texts under the name of Pulastya : a Dharmasūtra and a Smṛti. We find that the *Prayogapārijāta*[37] mentions Pulastya twice, once as an author of an *upasmṛti* and a second time as one of the other *smṛtikartās* . This would seem to support the suggestion of two different types of texts authored by Pulastya. Behind this suggestion is the tacit assumption that the Dharmasūtras, as contrasted with the Smṛtis, are mostly in the form of *sūtras* or prose aphorisms. Those, who would be inclined to support the suggestion of the composition of both a Dharmasūtra and a Smṛti by Pulastya, will explain the use of the term Smṛti for the two texts of Pulastya in the *Prayogapārijāta* by pointing that in listing the Dharmaśāstra authors the *Prayogapārijāta* does not discriminate between a Smṛti and a Dharmasūtra and uses the name Smṛti alike for both the types of texts.

But, the assumption of a difference between a Dharmasūtra and a Smṛti text, on the ground of the use of prose in the first and verses in the second, is a misleading argument. The Smṛti texts are also found to contain prose passages, and the Dharmasūtras, likewise, contain verses. Moreover, there is no independent testimony for a Dharmasūtra composed by Pulastya. It is to be noted that S. C. Banerji [38], who compiles a list of Dharmasūtra writers, known only through their quotations in later texts, and collects such prose passages, does not include Pulastya in his list. Either he did not notice the prose passages attributed to Pulastya, or else he rejected the possibility of a *Pulastya Dharmasūtra*.

The testimony of the *Prayogapārijāta* does not necessarily imply the existence of two texts composed by Pulastya. We have pointed out in a later context [39] that Aṅgiras and the author of the *Prayogapārijāta* seem to commit the mistake of prefixing to their list of Upasmṛtis a verse of Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya naming ten Dharmaśāstra writers and thus listing the name Pulastya twice. It

seems likely that there was only one *Pulastyasmṛti*, of which all the quotations, including prose passages, formed part. It is to be noted that, though a large majority of the Smṛtis are in verses, there are some which are in mixed prose and verses, whereas a few are entirely in prose[40]. There is, thus, no inherent contradiction in attributing both the prose passages and the verses to one and the same *Pulastyasmṛti*.

5. Two works of Pulastya

We do not want to dismiss the possibility of the repetition of some names of Dharm'aśāstra writers in the two lists in the *Prayogapārijāta* being a deliberate effort to record the actual facts. Aṅgiras and the author of the *Prayogapārijāta* may have tapped a verse of Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya for completing their list of Upasmṛtis associated with the names of all those authors who are listed here, including those whose names occur in the other lists in *Prayogapārijāta*.

We have seen later on [41] that the *Pulastyasmṛti* was not among the earlier Smṛtis and that Pulastya received recognition as a Dharmaśāstra writer first from Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya. As Pulastya was not one of the important Smṛti writers, the author of the *Prayogapārijāta* included him in his third list of other smṛtikartās. Subsequently another small Smṛti was composed for which also the name of Pulastya was adopted as its author. It was not a voluminous text. It did not cover many topics falling under the scope of Dharmaśāstra. On account of its limited scope and the limited number of verses in it, it was aptly described as an Upasmṛti by Aṅgiras and the author of the *Prayogapārijāta*

The available material associated with the name of Pulastya suits the above suggestion. We have a small Smṛti, containing twenty-nine verses, which has been published as *Pulastyasmṛti*. There does not seem to be any connection between this published Smṛti and the other Smṛti authored by Pulastya, from which quotations are recorded in medieval works. The published *Pulastyasmṛti* answers the requirements of the Upasmṛti of Pulastya. The Dharmaśāstra writer mentioned by Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya and included in the list of other smṛtikrtās in the *Prayogapārijāta* will then be the author of the *Pulastyasmṛti* from which we have received quotations.

6. Reconstruction of the text : its contents

The available extracts do not indicate the scheme of chapterisation adopted in the original Smṛti. We have grouped the verses into chapters, some of which have been further divided into sections.

We do not claim any finality for the headings of chapters and sections suggested by us. They are not mentioned in the extracts. The only exception is the heading *Kṛṣṇājindāna* for chapter V.

We have grouped the extracts under eleven chapters. The first chapter is introductory in nature. We have named it as *Dharmanirūpaṇam*. It possibly discussed such general problems as the meaning of the term Dharma, the nature and scope of the Dharmaśāstras, the ultimate aim of life, and the means for realising it. We have tentatively divided the chapter into two sections - *Dharmamūlam* and *Jñānakarmasamāyoga*. The first describes *Kalpasūtra* as dealing with Śrauta -karma. It refers to similar codes of Gṛhya rites. It seems that in the second section there was some discussion about conflicting provisions in different Smṛtis. The text advises that there should be a proper synthesis between *jñāna* (knowledge) and *karma* (action).

The second chapter has been named *Āhnikācāra*; it deals with the daily routine of duties. It consists of several sections, of which we have listed six here.

The first section provides for the method of taking bath (*snāna*). It praises bath in a river as of special merit. Of the rivers the Gaṅgā is eulogised for removing sin. Greater merit attaches to bath in a river in the vicinity of a Śivaliṅga. On the Puṣya, on one's birth constellation, on the Vyatipāta or the Vaidhṛti, as also on the Amāvasyā a river bath consecrates the family for seven generations. Those, who take a bath on a Sunday, Tuesday and Saturday, are never affected by ailments. On the fourteenth day of the dark half of Caitra, he who bathes in the vicinity of the God Śiva, in the Gaṅgā in particular, never dies.

The second section deals with dress to be put on (*vastradhāraṇa*) after the bath. In this connection it defines *ahata* (unspoiled cloth), the garment pure for use for all rites, as slightly blown, new, white, with ends on and as that which has not been put on.

The third section relates to *tripuṇḍra* or the application of forehead marks with sanctified ashes and mentions the religious merit resulting from the use of different *mantras*.

The rules about *sandhyā* are placed in the fourth section. Though full details have not survived, we have indications that there were lengthy provisions. One of the surviving passages provides that *sandhyā*, *iṣṭi*, *caru* and *homa* are to be performed throughout the life and are not to be given up even in the case of impurity caused by death (*sūtaka*) ; one abandoning them goes to degradation. One should recite the *mantras* mentally without doing *prāṇāyāma*. Another extract requires a person to recite the *sandhyā mantra* a lac times.

The fifth section deals with rules about taking meals (*bhojana*). One should eat with a concentrated mind, taking sweet in the beginning, saltish and acid in the middle, and stringent, bitter, etc. in the end. One should take one's meals leaving a remnant, excepting the curds, barley food, clarified butter, meat, milk, honey and water. After finishing one's meal one should sip water and, in the name of those entitled to a share in the remnant of food, drop, along with water, a part of all the items of food. On the occasion of a *parva* there should be no fasting, nor eating in the evening; one should take one small meal in the form of sacrificial food devoid of oil and meat. One should not eat on the *ekādaśī* day and a woman should not eat during menses. One should hold a drinking pot with one's right hand and not with the left one.

The sixth section lists twelve intoxicating drinks (*madyāni*), of which *surā* is the worst. It says that on drinking the fresh juice of *drākṣā* (grapes), *ikṣu* (sugarcane), *ṭaṅka* (wood-apple) *khajūra* (date) and *panasa* (jack fruit) one is purified after three days.

The third chapter relates to the worship of god (*devapūjā*). It requires all the objects used in the worship to be sprinkled and water to be sipped before starting any performance or holy rite. The abrupt beginning of the quotation, implied by the use of the pronoun *tena* (by that), shows that the preceding verses have not been recorded. The introductory remark (*ācamanānantaram*) in the *Caturvarga-cintāmaṇi* [42] would suggest that there were verses providing for purificatory sipping of water. The passage lists the trees which are

to be avoided in making wooden seats (*pīṭha*) for use in rites concerning ancestors and gods. After getting up in the morning one should be purified and submit to lord Viṣṇu " I shall be doing all the work as directed by you ". After offering prayers one should awaken Viṣṇu with musical instruments. In several verses we have different names of Viṣṇu which are to be recited (*japet*) for different objectives: fulfilment of desire, achieving victory, studies, release from bondage, cure of eye trouble, freedom from fear, use of medicine, proceeding to the battle-field, living in another place, in legal disputes, in sneezing or stumbling, when afflicted by asterism and planets, or divine obstacles, when hindered by robbers and enemies, when facing lions and tigers, when engulfed in darkness, when suffering from fever, for removing the effect of snake's poison, when storing wealth and grains, in case of bad dreams, for prosperity, for getting a progeny, in case of bad omens, fear of death through storm, fire, water or chain. Whatever desire may arise, one should think of Him in all matters. One secures the accomplishment of all desires by remembering these names, as they have one and the same import, whether they are the names of one Supreme Brahma or not.

The fourth chapter deals with religious gifts (*dāna*). The surviving verses relate to the offering of gifts on special occasions such as *ayana* (solstice), *viṣuva* (equinox), *viṣṇupadi*,[43] *saṅkrānti*[44] and eclipse. On the occasion of the eclipse of the Sun by Rāhu one should, after touching the water of a nearby *tīrtha*, with a view to desiring fruits from charity, commence a *satra* donation. If a rite is performed at an improper time, it should be performed again when the proper time is reached. A rite, which is performed after the proper time has passed is to be regarded as not done.

It seems that there were separate chapters dealing with special types of *dānas*. The Dharmaśāstra tradition preserves a rich literature on *dāna* in the Nibandhas. They relate to various types of special *dānas*: *tulāpuruṣadānas*, *mahādānas* and *parvatadānas*. We can never be sure about the special *dānas* covered by our Smṛti. The provisions appeared in texts, some of which, on account of their greater respectability, became the natural sources for being quoted by later texts. This may explain the absence of quotations from the relevant chapters in our text.

In view of the merit associated with it, the method of giving the gift of the skin of a black deer was described in a chapter, which, in our reconstruction, is numbered as the fifth chapter. In the month of Kārttika on the full moon day, or in Vaiśākha on the occasion of lunar or solar eclipse, equinox or solstice the skin of a black deer, with hoofs and horns intact, without any wounds, and pleasing to look at, is to be given to a Brāhmaṇa.

We do not have quotations from other chapters in the text which dealt with special types of *dānas*. But, the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* in the *Dānakhaṇḍa*[45] quotes in full the provisions about some of these *dānas* occurring in the *Padmapurāṇa* as the utterances of Pulastya. They begin with the expression *Pulastya uvāca* and end with *Iti Padmapurāṇoktaḥ parvata* (or *acala*) *dānavidhiḥ*. They relate to *dhānyaparvatadāna*, *lavaṇācaladāna*, *guḍācaladāna*, *suvarṇācaladāna*, *rūpyācaladāna* and *śarkarācaladāna*. The *Vidhānapārijāta*[46] also reproduces these provisions (as utterances of Pulastya in the *Padmapurāṇa*) on the *dānas* of *guḍācala*, *suvarṇācala*, *tilācala*, *ratnācala*, *raupyācala* and *śarkarācala*. The introductory verse in all these cases has the set formula of *Athātaḥ sampravakṣyāmi*. Only in the case of *suvarṇācaladāna* we have a slightly different phrase *Atha pāpaharaṃvakṣye*.

These passages are not to be found in the available text of the *Padmapurāṇa*. Instead we find them in the *Viṣṇupurana*,[47] but as utterances of Īśvara and not of Pulastya. It is interesting to note that one manuscript of the *Dānoddyota*[48] section of the *Madanaratnapradīpa* quotes the verses on *suvarṇācaladāna*, *tilācaladāna* and *ratnācaladāna* as being from the *Padmapurāṇa*. All this would make a case that earlier the *Padmapurāṇa* or its manuscripts in certain regions contained provisions about several types of *parvatadānas*[49], but, in course of time, they tended to be dropped out. In view of the specific references in the *Caturvarga-cintāmaṇi*, supported by two other texts, we cannot say that the attribution of these passages to the *Padmapurāṇa* was the result of a confusion in certain circles. We must note that Hemādri quotes *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, *Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa* and *Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa* on these *dānas*. This also confirms the attribution. We find that the readings in the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* are generally to be found in the *Matsyapurāṇa* as well, whereas the *Vidhānapārijāta*

shows some variations. It is not unlikely that the two Purāṇas (*Padma* and *Matsya*) drew upon the same common source.

The verses introducing the account about the *dhānyaparvatadāna* in the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*[50] indicates that Bhīṣma asked Pulastya to instruct him about the religious merit of *dāna* in general (*dānamāhātmyam*). In his reply Pulastya proposed to describe the *merudāna* of ten types, which is the same as *parvatadāna* or *acaladāna* of other texts. He lays down general rules governing such *dānas* and then goes on to record special provisions about other types of *acaladānas*. All these seem to have formed part of a big chapter on *dānas*. This is confirmed by another long passage in the same text[51] giving rules about *pañcadhenudāna* intended as an utterance of Pulastya in the *Padmapurāṇa*. We can infer that according to Hemādri the *Padmapurāṇa* had several chapters as utterances of Pulasyta and describing different types of *dānas* : *parvatadānas*, *mahādānas*, *dhenudānas* and *tulāpuruṣadānas*.

The section of *dāna* in the *Padmapurāṇa* as recorded in the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* began with an account of *merudāna*[52]. On the request of Bhīṣma Pulastya proposes to describe[53] the ten types of *merudānas* in the form of *parvatas* of *dhānya, lavaṇa, guḍa, hema, tila, karpāsa, ghṛta, ratna, rajata* and *śarkarā*. He goes on to lay down general provisions governing these *dānas* followed by specific details about the *dhānyaparvatadāna*. We do not have here the introductory sentence parallel to those for other *parvatadānas* *Athātaḥ sampravakṣyāmi*. At the end of the provision we do not get the concluding expression *iti Padmapurāṇoktaḥ .....dānavidhiḥ*. This is possibly because this chapter served as an introductory one for the whole section. We have noted above the chapters dealing with eight other *parvatadānas*. The *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* quotes from the *Padmapurāṇa* the provisions about *karpāsaparvatadāna*[54]. But, here we do not have either the expression *Pulastya uvāca* or the introductory sentence or the concluding expression. But, comparing it with other chapters we can suggest that this also was a part of the fuller account. It is like the chapter on *tiladānavidhānam* in being introduced by the expression *Padmapurāṇāt* and in omitting the concluding expression. The chapter on *tiladānavidhānam*, like all other chapters, has the expression *Pulastya uvāca* which would

seem to have been inadvertently dropped in the case of the quotation of the chapter on *karpāsaparvatadāna*.

It seems that the *Padmapurāṇa* also contained accounts of some *vratas* as described by Pulastya. The *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* contains one such quotation on Viśvavrata (Appendix II-A) which, however, cannot be traced in the available text of the *Padmapurāṇa*. The *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* records two more passage as utterances of Pulastya reported as occurring in the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*. One of these provides details about the Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa-vrata (Appendix II-B), whereas the other concerns Ghṛtasnānavrata (Appendix II-C). That this was not a mistake on the part of the author of the *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma* is indicated by the fact that the *Smṛticandrikā*, one of the early Nibandha texts, also quotes from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* the utterances of Pulastya. These possibly relate to the Ghṛtasnānavrata, as they include one of the two verses on the topic quoted by the *Jayasiṃhakalpadruma*. But, none of these passages occur in the available text of the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*.

The *Tīrthayātrāparva* section in the *Āraṇyakaparva* of the *Mahābhārata* contains the views of Pulastya on *tīrthas* and *tīrthayātra*[55]. The context is provided by the departure of Arjuna which makes the Pāṇḍavas sad and deeply dejected. Nārada appears and, to the enquiry made by Yudhiṣṭhira about the merit of pilgrimage, refers to the interlocution between Bhīṣma and Pulastya. Bhīṣma earlier sought from Pulastya enlightenment about the efficacy of going on pilgrimage. The reply given by Pulastya extends from *Mbh.* III. 80.29 to *Mbh*. III. 83.95.

In the introductory verses Pulastya refers to the cult of pilgrimage as practised by the sages. It was a secret practice known to the sages. The merit of pilgrimage is enjoyed by a person who has control over his limbs and mind, who has the necessary moral qualities, and is free from all the vices. Pulastya eulogises it as better than the cult of sacrifices. Sacrifices entail much expenditure and cannot be performed by a poor man. The religious merit accruing from pilgrimage cannot be received even by performing *agniṣṭoma* and other sacrifices.

Pulastya describes various *tīrthas* in different parts of the country. These include places, forests, *āśramas*, mountains, rivers, their confluences with other rivers and seas, and lakes and

reservoirs. The account refers to the specific religious acts to be perfomed at the *tīrthas*. Taking bath, observing fast and giving *dānas* are the important items. In all cases the religious merit accruing from the pilgrimage is mentioned.

Concluding his account Pulastya says that this is the truth for the twice-born and pious people and is to be recited in the ears of one's progenies, dear ones, students and followers. It is meritorious, pious and bestower of happiness and leads to heaven. This secret practice of the great sages removes all the sins. By reading it one becomes pure. Hearing this account of the *tīrthas* is also meritorious. One should visit mentally the *tīrthas* which are difficult to reach.

It is clear from the account in the *Mahābhārata* that traditionally Pulastya was considered to be the foremost champion of pilgrimage. Whether this account of the cult of pilgrimage and the description of the various *tīrthas* was derived from some text composed by him cannot be confirmed.

In the surviving quotations of the *Pulastyasmṛti* we have references to the *tīrthas* and eulogy of the Gaṅgā. We cannot trace parallels in expressions and passages, but there is some similarity in the general view on these points. We cannot establish that in the Smṛti text there was a separate chapter on *tīrthas*. Thus, the relevant chapters in the *Mahābhārata* are useful in indicating the views of Pulastya, whose name is associated with a Smṛti, which also seems to have attached great importance to *tīrthas*, but we cannot maintain that similar accounts occurred in the original *Pulastyasmṛti*[56].

Chapter VI deals with purification (*śuddhivicāra*). Here also the surviving verses indicate that the original chapter was a long one. One verse says that one going to the road or market is not purified by sipping water, if he does not wash his feet. The second verse indicates that there were detailed provisions about purification for a householder..

Chapter VII deals with rites of purification when one is bitten by animals, particularly dogs (*paśudaṣṭe śuddhiḥ*). There are special provisions if the victim is doing a *vrata*, is bitten in a village devoid of Brāhmaṇas, is a Brāhmaṇa woman, is a *snātaka*, or is a woman in menses. If the person is bitten above the navel, the purificatory penances are double, if in the mouth three times, and if in the head

four times.

The rites for purification in case of talking with a *pāṣaṇḍī* (heretic) (*pāṣaṇḍisaṃsarge śuddhiḥ*), are detailed in chapter VIII. A *pāṣaṇḍī* is described as a person who has violated the duties of his *varṇa* and *āśrama* as ordained in the Vedas and Smṛtis, behaves according to his will following false reasoning, resorts to evil deeds, possesses an evil character, and indulges in hypocritic rites. In later verses the *pāṣaṇḍins* are described as eulogising evil food, eating unpurified food, devoid of sacraments, conceited, intermixing the *varṇas*, earning their living through false religion, performing austerities without purification, atheists, fallen from the noble path ordained in the Vedas, and denouncing the rites prescribed in *Ṛk*, *Yajus* and *Sāma*n. Later they are further described as denouncing Vedic rites, without faith in Vedic rites, and as having the thoughts of a devil. On account of delusion their sense of righteous conduct is destroyed; they give up the duties of their *varṇa;* impelled by false knowledge they commit sin under a sense of *dharma;* their knowledge is destroyed; they give replies which involve false reasoning; they apply themselves and others in evil deeds and fall from their *dharma*. For purification one has to meditate upon Viṣṇu under the name of Acyuta and has to offer faithful prayers. In case of seeing, talking to, or touching the *pāṣaṇḍins* one has to take bath.

In chapter IX on expiation (*prāyaścitta*) the details of the provisions in different cases for sin have not been recorded. A woman, an old man or a sick person is to do half of the expiations, whereas a child is to do only one-fourth of it. A man who has not undergone sacraments, who cannot exert, is sick and is in his nineties[57] is to perform expiation according to his capacity, because in such a case the *vrata* is not lost.

Chapter X dealing with funeral rites (*śrāddha*) seems to have been among the long chapters. The surviving verses can be classified into eight sections. The first section relates to the rules about cremation (*antyeṣṭi*). If the rites of the father, who died earlier, have not been performed and the mother dies subsequently, her cremation and other rites are to be done along with her husband and the two are to be cremated on the same pyre from the *aupasana* fire. The second section concerns provisions about impurities resulting from death (*sūtaka*). There is no such impurity in water, cowpen, *tīrthas*, on

parvas and seeing Rāhu. There is immediate purification, if the deceased damsel is young in age; after a day, if she is grown up; after three days, if she is betrothed, and after a fortnight, if she is offered in marriage. In the third section on oblations (*tarpaṇa*) it is laid down that when offering oblations one should bend his knee a little. In offering to the gods one should sprinkle the right knee with the *kuśas* having their foreparts pointing to the east; in offering to the ancestors one should sprinkle the left knee and use twofold *kuśas*. After offering oblations one should come out of the water and should squeeze his lower garment on the bank. The fourth section requires that the *ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha* (funeral rites for one particular individual) is not to be performed before the *sapiṇḍana* of the parents, after which it is resumed. In the fifth section it is provided that *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa* (the performance of *srāddha*) for a kinsman, entitled to the same funeral rice-ball offering as of one's father and mother, is to be done after the *saṃvatsara* is over, but without the use of fire. The sixth section provides that the ten types of sons are to perform the *śrāddha* every year, those other than the *aurasa* are to do it without fire; the *pārvaṇa* (common funeral rites performed on the *parva*) is to be done without fire. If the period of the *parva* and the day of death coincide or if one dies on the new moon day or *pretapakṣa*, then the *pārvaṇaśrāddha* is to be done, but never the *ekoddiṣṭa*. If the father dies during *pretapakṣa*, the *pārvaṇa* is to be done. For a person having first cousins the *ekoddiṣṭa* is to be done.

Section seven concerns the objects to to be offered as gifts on the occasion of funeral rites (*śrāddhadāna*). *Śrāddha* is defined as the purified and nice food made of milk, curd and ghee which is offered with reverence (*śraddhayā*). The food to be offered for a Brāhmaṇa is the food taken by ascetics, meat for a Kṣatriya and a Vaiśya, and honey for a Śūdra, and for all what is not repugnant to them. In *śrāddha* one is to avoid meat which is not consecrated by sprinkling (*aprokṣita*), which is not produced by the king (*rājānutpādita*)and which is killed by a hunter. It lists seven trees from which seat (*pīṭha*) to be offered to the ancestors is to be made. It provides that on the two *ayana* (solstice) days, the two *viṣuvat* (equinoxe) days on any Saṅkrānti, on Ekādaśī and Trayodaśī and during Bharaṇī, Maghā and Kṛttikā *piṇḍas* are not to be offered. It

provides for separate *śrāddha* to be offered on *mahālaya* day, funeral rites in Gayā and on the day of the death.

The eighth section possibly provided for the people who could perform the *śrāddha*. In one verse *mātāmahas* are defined as three generations of grandfathers beginning with the father of one's mother. For them the daughter's son should perform *śrāddha* as for the father (*mātāmahaśrāddha*).

Pulastya made special provisions for the funeral rites of ascetics (*saṃnyastānām śrāddhavidhānam*) separately in chapter XI. Among the ascetics he mentions the *kuṭīcaka*, *bāhūdaka*, *haṃsa*, *paramahaṃsa*,*ekadaṇḍī*, *tridaṇḍī*, and *manodaṇḍī*. The *kuṭīcaka* is to be cremated, *bahūda* is to be buried, *haṃsa* is to be thrown in the water and *paramahaṃsa* is to exposed for being torn to pieces[58]. *Sapiṇḍīkaraṇa* is not to be done for them. On the eleventh day the *pārvaṇa śrāddha* is to be done. The son should perform the *piṇḍayajña*, the *darśa śrāddha* upon the day of death. For a *yatī* the *pārvaṇa* shall be upon a *mahālayā* or a *darśa* or upon his death anniversary; for others it shall be the *ekoddiṣṭa*. In the case of their dead bodies there is no impurity. One who carries the dead body receives the merit of an Aśvamedha at each step. With faith in Viṣṇu one should take bath and go home. If he takes bath thinking of impurity, he is subjected to the punishment of the sugarcane mill [59]. The provisions are made applicable to the *ekadaṇḍī* and *tridaṇḍī* ascetics. It is further provided that the *pārvaṇa śrāddha* is to be performed by the *aurasa* son of the ascetic.

References

1. We have followed the dates of all these texts generally as given by Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol.I, Parts I &II.
1a. Neither Kane nor the editor of the *Pradīpatraya* gives his date.
2. I.1.3; X.5.1.
3. II.5.5.
4. II.4.12.
5. X.7.2.
6. X.5.1.
7. I.1.1-2.
8. X.3.1.
9. X.5.1.
10. II.3.1-2a.
11. II.1.6.
12. X.3.1.
13. II.1.4; I.1.1-2; II.5.2.
14. II.5.2;II.4.1; II.1.9.
15. II.5.1;X.7.8.
16. II.1.6; II.5.5; X.2.2; X.7.2, 4, 6, 8; X.8.1.
17. X.7.6.
18. X.7.5a-6.
19. II.4.1-2; IV.4.
20. Kane, *Op. cit.*, p. 1066.
21. Assisted by Ratnākara, Gopīnātha and Gaṅgādharabhaṭṭa. See Kane, *Op.cit.*, Pp.806-7.
22. Kane, *Op.cit.*, Pp. 808-9.
23. I.1.1-2,3; II.1.6; II.4.1.2; II.5.5; X. 3.1; X.5.1; X.7.2.
24. K.V.Rangaswami Aiyangar, *Bṛhaspatismṛti* (Reconstructed) (Gaekwad Oriental Series LXXXV) Baroda, 1941.
25. P.V.Kane, *Kātyāyanasmṛtisāroddhāra*(*Hindu Law Quarterly*, Bombay), Reprinted Poona, 1933.
26. B.K. Ghosh, *Vyāsasmṛti* (*Indian Culture*, Vol.IX, Pp.65-98).
27. II.4.1-2 (*Vidhānapārijāta* and *Śrāddhakdpalatā*) ; IV.2.3 (*Muhūrtacintāmaṇi*); X.7.6 (*Smṛtisāroddhāra, Nirṇayāmṛta, Smṛtimuktāphala, Puruṣārthacintāmaṇi, Vīramitrodaya* Samayaprakāśa, *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*).
28. *Prāyaścittapradīpa*(in *Pradīpatraya*), P.22; *Ācārabhūṣaṇa*, P.22.
29. Pulastya I.6.1-2; *Prāyaścittapradīpa* (in *Pradīpatraya*), P.22 in connection with *Abhakṣyaprāyaścitta*; *Vīramitrodaya*, Śuddhi, P.137 in connection with *Dehādiśuddhinirūpaṇa* .

30. Pulastya, Ch.V.
31. *Smṛticandrikā*, Translation.
32. *Op. cit.* , P. 517, f.n. 609.
33. Folio 51a (= Pulastya V.1-2 upto *manoharam* only) as quoted by Kane , *Op. cit.*
34. Page48- तथा 'कृष्णाजिनदाने पुलस्त्य:- सर्वगुणविशिष्टं ददानी (मी) ति।
35. *Dānakhaṇḍa*, Pp.703-5.
36. Page 222- गङ्गायां शतसाहस्री।
37. Quoted in *Vīramitrodaya*, Paribhāṣāprakāśa, P.18.
38. *Dharmasūtras: A Study in their origin and development.*
39. See *infra* section III. A. 2.
40. Kane, *Op. cit.*, Vol.I, P.304.
41. See *infra* Section III.A. 2.
42. *Śrāddhakalpa*, Part I, P.402.
43. The Sun's passage into the zodiacal signs of Vṛṣa, Siṃha, Vṛścika and Kumbha—Monier—Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, s.v.*Viṣṇupadi.*
44. Passage of the Sun or a planet from one sign or position in the heavens into another—Monier-Williams, *Loc, cit.*, s.v. *saṅkrānti.*
45. Pages 346-84. We reproduce them as Appendix I-A.
46. Pages 139-47. The introductory phrase is *Padme Pulastya uvāca.*
47. Chapters 84-92.
48. Vol. II, Pp.302, 304, 309. It attributes (*Ibid.*, P. 306) the verses on *Karpāsācaladāna* also to the *Padmapurāṇa*. Another manuscript mentions only the verses on *suvarṇācaladāna* as occurring in the *Padmapurāṇa.*
49. The *Vidhānapārijāta* does not reproduce similar provisions about *dhānyācaladāna, lavaṇācaladāna, karpāsācaladāna, ghṛtācaladāna* and *śikharadāna.*
50. *Dānakhaṇḍa*, p. 346.
51. *Ibid.*, Pp.406-7. See Appendix I-B.
52. *Ibid.*, Pp. 346-56.
53. This is in line with the *Mahābhārata* which in the Āraṇyakaparva records the interlocution between these two about *tīrthayātrā.*
54. Page 376.
55. *Mbh.*, III. 80-83.
56. We are not reproducing here the relevant four chapters in the *Mahābhārata.* The introductory as well as concluding verses are being quoted in Appendix III.
57. *Navatijīvakaḥ* is not very regular. It may refer to a man in his nineties and hence very weak and about to die shortly.

58. *Vidārayet* in the *Smṛticandrikā* quotation is translated by Gharpure as "one should tear out". The causative form suggests that the body of a *paramahaṃsa* is to be caused to be torn asunder. It refers to the practice of exposing the corpse to be eaten by birds and beasts of pray.
59. XI.4- *ikṣuyantram vrajennaraḥ*. According to *Skandapurāṇa*, I.2.51.27 a dealer in liquor is crushed in the *ikṣuyantra* in the hell.

Chapter 3

A. The Date of the Pulastyasmṛti

1. Kane's View

Kane[1] has suggested the time-bracket of fourth to seventh century for the *Pulastyasmṛti*. He does not specify the evidence on which he bases his opinion. But, evidently he relies on the fact that quotations from Pulastya are recorded by Viśvarūpa (*Bālakrīḍā*), Vijnāneśvara *(Mitākṣarā)*, Aparārka, Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa *(Smṛticandrikā)* and Caṇḍeśvara *(Dānaratnākara)*. Of these Viśvarūpa is the earliest. Kane identifies Viśvarūpa with Sureśvara, one of the four pupils of Śaṅkara, the great Advaita philosopher, and hence narrows down the time-bracket of A.D. 750-1000 for Viśvarūpa to A.D. 800-825[2]. It may be noted that elsewhere Kane[3] himself had suggested that Sureśvara's literary activity is to be placed betweem A.D 810 and 840. It would, thus, seem that Kane places the lower limit for the date of the composition of the *Pulastyasmṛti* about a hundred years before Viśvarūpa-Sureśvara

2. The recognition of Pulastya as a Smṛti writer

A rough approximation of the upper limit for the composition of the *Pulastyasmṛti* can be deduced from the history of the inclusion of the name of Pulastya in the list of Dharmaśāstra writers.

But, we must be aware of the limitations of this line of argument. We have many lists of authors of ancient Dharmaśāstra texts. The absence of the name of a particular Dharmaśāstra author in any one of these lists is not a sure argument for inferring that he belonged to a later date. This is only an *argumentum exsilentio.* The silence about the name of that author can be explained in many possible ways. At best it can show that the author in question did not receive recognition as an authority in the circle connected with that particular list. He could have flourished even before the date of the compilation of that list. The list, in which the name of the author appears first, provides a date which serves as the upper limit before

which he has to be placed.

The name of Pulastya does not find a place in the earlier lists of Dharmaśāstra writers. The list of sixteen authors *(praṇetāraḥ)* of Dharmaśāstras, attributed variously to Gautama[4] and Śaṅkha-Likhita[5], does not contain the name of Pulastya. Yājñavalkya's list of eighteen expounders *(vaktāraḥ)* of Dharmaśāstras[6] as also Parāśara's list of nineteen expounders[7] does not mention the name of Pulastya. Pulastya received recognition first at the hands of Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya[8], who mentions ten names of expounders of *dharma(dharmavaktāraḥ)* in addition to those originally listed by Yājñavalkya. But the name of Pulastya was not retained in later lists of Smṛtis, even though their number was increased to twenty-four and thirty-six. The *Caturviṃśatimata* takes into account twenty-four *dharmaśāstrakaras*. There are two slightly varying lists attributed to Paiṭhīnasi and the *Bhaviṣyatpurāṇa*. [9]

Pulastya's name occurs among the authors of *upasmṛtis (upasmṛtividhāyakas)* listed in verses attributed to Aṅgiras[10]. Here we have in all twenty-eight names. It seems that to the original list of eighteen (or nineteen) names were prefixed the ten names occurring in the verse, attributed to Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya, which we have quoted above.

The *Prayogapārijāta*[11] gives a long list of Smṛtis classified into three groups: eighteen principal Smṛtikaras, eighteen *upasmṛtis* and twenty-one other Smṛtikartās We find Pulastya occurring in the two categories of eighteen *upasmṛtis* and twenty-one other Smṛtikartās. The presence of the name of Pulastya in two of the three categories in the *Prayogapārijāta* would seem to be a mistake, unless we infer that there were two separate Smṛtis associated with the name of Pulastya. It is to be noted that out of the ten names, occurring in the first verse, which is prefixed to the verse enumerating *upasmṛtis*, nine, including Pulastya, are found to have been repeated in the *Prayogapārijāta* itself. Thus, Nārada, Pulaha, Gārgya, Pulastya, Kratu and Pitāmaha are included in the list of twenty-one "other Smṛtikartās", whereas Jātūkaṃya (for Jātukarṇa), Baudhāyana and Viśvāmitra are repeated in the subsequent verses listing *upasmṛtis*, and found in Aṅgiras. This shows that the list of *upasmirtis* , recorded alike by Aṅgiras and the author of the *Prayogapārijāta* ,mentions Jātukarṇa (or Jātūkaṃya), Baudhāyana

and Viśvāmitra twice. The repetition can be explained by suggesting that both Aṅgiras and the author of the *Prayogapārijāta* inadvertently prefixed Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya's list of ten additional *smṛtis* to their list of *upasmṛtis*.

The above analysis shows that Pulastya was accommodated as a Smṛti writer first by Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya and later by the author of the *Prayogapārijāta* in his list of other Smṛtikartās and that Aṅgiras, followed by the author of the *Prayogapārijāta*, further included the *Pulastyasmṛti* in the list of *upasmṛtis*. If the occurrence of the name of a Dharmaśāstra writer in any list of the authors of Dharmaśāstra is an indication of the date of the composition of his text, it may be suggested that Pulastya belonged to a period after Yājñavalkya but before Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya, Aṅgiras and the *Prayogapārijāta*.

It is difficult to date precisely all these Dharmaśāstra authors and texts. But the latest opinion of Kane on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* is that "it was composed during the first two centuries of the Christian era or even a little earlier."[12]

The date of Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya, though highly relevant to our present discussion, is difficult to determine. Kane describes his text as "comparatively ancient" and places it earlier than A.D. 1000.[13] The original text of Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya is not available. All the quotations from his text which occur in later texts have not been collected and collated. Hence, we cannot advance any definite date on the basis of the internal evidence of his text.[14] The upper limit for the date of Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya is provided by his name itself which presupposes the existence and wide circulation of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*. The Smṛti named after him has to be placed after the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*. We can fix the lower limit of the date for Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya on the basis of the fact that his verses are quoted, among others, by Jitendriya,[15] Viśvarūpa,[16] Aparārka [17] and Vijñāneśvara.[18] The date of Jitendriya is not known. Viśvarūpa being earlier than Aparārka and Vijñāneśvara, the dates of the latter two will not materially affect our calculations about the date of Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya. Kane[19], on the basis of a due consideration of all relevant evidence, places Viśvarūpa about A.D. 800-825. Hence Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya may not be later than A.D.. 700.

The dates of Aṅgiras and the *Prayogapārijāta* have not been determined[20]. But, certainly they would be later than Vṛddha-

Yājñavalkya, whose one verse, listing ten Dharmaśāstra writers, they seem to have borrowed.

Thus, on the basis of the likely dates for Yājñavalkya and Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya we may suggest that the Dharmaśāstra attributed to Pulastya was composed after the second century but before the beginning of the seventh century of the Christian era.

3. Pulastya's Contemporaries

A verse defining *śrāddha*[21] has been attributed to Pulastya by Raghunandana in his *Smṛtitattva*[22]. The same verse is ascribed to Bṛhaspati by Aparārka [23], Hemādri [24], Lakṣmīdhara [25] and Mitramiśra[26]. In view of the specific attribution we cannot explain any one of the two views as wrong. The very fact that, inspite of the long line of established authorities attributing the verse to Bṛhaspati, Raghunandana thought it proper to mention Pulastya as its author, proves that it did occur in the Smṛti ascribed to Pulastya.

There can be two alternative explanations of the double authorship of the verse. One possibility is that both the Smṛti writers drew upon a common source. But, we do not know of any earlier text which has this verse. It is not unlikely that the verse formed part of the fund of Dharmaśāstra injunctions which circulated orally and received general acceptance. When Bṛhaspati and Pulastya included it in their texts, they did not feel that they were borrowing it from another text.

A second possibility is that one of the two Smṛti-writers borrowed it from the other.The larger number and the earlier date of the later authorities ascribing the verse to Bṛhaspati will indieate that the general opimion favoured Bṛhaspati as its author. Bṛhaspati is generally considered to be one of the earlier and more important Smṛti authors. His chronological seniority will rule out the possibility of his borrowing it from Pulastya. This fact will, on the contrary, make a case for Pulastya copying the verse from Bṛhaspati.

The first possibility indicated above will suggest that Pulastya was not far removed from Bṛhaspati in time. The second possibility will show that Pulastya came after Bṛhaspati. Thus, the earliest chronological position, which we can assign to Pulastya, is as a junior contemporary of Bṛhaspati, But, how much later than

Bṛhaspati he actually appeared is to be determined by considering other relevant facts.

On the authority of Hemādri, the *Śrāddhacandrikā*[27] ascribes two verses [28] on *piṇḍadāna* to both Bṛhat-Parāśara and Pulastya. These are the two verses of Pulastya which have been quoted most by the authors of the commentaries and digests. In the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* of Hemādri the second verse has been attributed to Pulastya at several places. It is clear that the medieval writers did not have any doubt about Pulastya being the author of these verses.

A Smṛti text under the name of Bṛhat-Parāśara has been printed by Jivananda. [29] Parāśara is credited with the authorship of many texts belonging to different branches of learning, including agriculture and astrology.[30] The *Parāśarasmṛti* was followed by at least two other Smṛtis adopting the name of Parāśara: Vṛddha-Parāśara and Bṛhat-Parāśara.[31]

Kane [32] has not determined the date of Bṛhat-Parāśara. He simply describes it as a late work. The name Bṛhat-Parāśara itself indicates that it belongs to a period later than the composition of the *Parāśarasmṛti*. Earlier Kane had suggested the time-bracket A.D. 600-900 [33] for the *Parāśarasmṛti*, but in the second edition of the first volume of his *History of Dharmaśāstra* he has chosen to remain vague.[34] It is likely that there was an ancient *Parāśarasmṛti*, but the extant *Parāśarasmṛti* is definitely later than the *Manusmṛti* and earlier than the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* and the *Garuḍapurāṇa*. It must have taken a long time to acquire recognition to be quoted by the early medieval Dharmaśāstra writers Aparārka, Vijñāneśvara, Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa and Hemādri. Bṛhat-Parāśara presumes the existence of the *Parāśarasmṛti*, but it will not be correct to describe it as "a recast of the Parāśara-smṛti"[35]. It is a voluminous text containing about 3000 verses [36] as compared to 592 verses in the *Parāśarasmṛti*. The text itself says that it was composed by a certain Suvrata. Whereas Parāśara does not have a detailed account on *śrāddha*, Bṛhat-Parāśara devotes a full chapter (V) to it. It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that Bṛhat-Parāśara was recognised as being authoritative on matters concerning *śrāddha*.

The grouping of the names of Pulastya and Bṛhat-Parāśara is not of much help in determining the date of Pulastya. It does not seem

to be a case of two contemporaries drawing upon the same common source. The undoubted testimony of a long line of medieval Dharmaśāstra writers makes a strong case for Bṛhat-Parāśara borrowing from Pulastya. Thus, the reference to Bṛhat-Parāśara in the *Śrāddhacandrikā* can be useful in suggesting a lower limit beyond which Pulastya cannot be dragged.

We do not have any details about Suvrata, the author of the *Bṛhat-Parāśara*. The internal evidence can positivate only about its being later than the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* and *Parāśarasmṛti*. The fact that Bṛha-Parāśara is quoted by later Dharmaśāstra writers, Bhaṭṭojī and Nandapaṇḍita, and not by earlier ones, Viśvarūpa, Aparārka and Vijñāneśvara, would indicate that Bṛhat-Parāśara cannot be placed much before the ninth century. Pulastya, on this ground, cannot be later than the eighth century.

A similar situation exists in relation to a verse [37] quoted by the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* and the *Puruṣārthacintāmaṇi* [38] relying on Hemādri. It is ascribed to both Pulastya and Satyavrata. In the present case there cannot be any question of a confusion about original authorship, because the same text mentions both the Smṛtikaras as the authors of the verse. Here also the possibility of one borrowing from the other cannot be ruled out theoretically, though it is more likely that both derived the verse from one common source. Satyavrata is a comparatively less known Smṛti writer. He would stand in the same relation to Pulastya as Pulastya does in relation to Bṛhaspati. The exact date of Satyavrata is also not known. He appears to have been one of the later Smṛti authors. Pulastya may be taken to have been a contemporary of Satyavrata, possibly a senior one.

Thus, we may place Pulastya between Bṛhaspati and Satyavrata. Though Jolly [39] had placed Bṛhaspati in the sixth or seventh century A.D., according to Kane [40] Bṛhaspati flourished between A.D. 200 and 400. No scholar has cared to suggest any date for Satyavrata. As the text of the Smṛti composed by him is not available, we cannot make any guess about his date.

Pulastya has two verses recommending a combination of *jñāna* and *karma*. [41] They occur in Aparārka's commentary on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*. [42] Lakṣmīdhara in his *Kṛtyakalpataru*[43] attributes these verses to Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya. It is interesting to find that Aparārka himself in another context [44] quotes the first of these two verses from Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya. The two verses actually occur in the *Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkyasmṛti*. [45]

Kane [46] describes Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya as comparatively an early work and places it between A.D. 300 and 700. But on this account the conflicting views about the authorship of the verses do not pose any serious problem. Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya is known to have absorbed without acknowledgement several verses and passages from the *Manusmṛti*, *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, *Bhagavadgīta* and *Upaniṣads*. [47] It is, therefore, not unlikely that he borrowed the passages from Pulastya.[48]

As we have pointed out earlier, Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya is the first to recognise Pulastya as a Dharmaśāstra writer.[49] Quotations in later commentaries and Nibandha texts indicate that there were two separate texts under the names of Bṛhad-Yājñavalkya and Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya.[50] Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya seems to be different from both these; but, on the basis of their names, we can place Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya after these two texts. The chronological position of Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya will not go against the suggestion that Pulastya was the original author of the verses.

As the verses occurred in both Pulastya and Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya, Aparārka cannot be criticised for attributing them to one of these at one place and to the other at another. Lakṣmīdhara does not attribute them to Pulastya, possibly because he could not get a copy of the *Pulastyasmṛti*. It is not without significance that his monumental work does not contain a single quotation from the *Pulastyasmrti*.

The borrowing of the two Pulastya verses by Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya will require us to place Pulastya before Bṛhadyogi-Yājñavalkya.

4. Tīrthayātrāparva and Pulastyasmṛti

One possible clue to the date of Pulastya is provided by the *Tīrthayāpatrārva* in the *Āraṇyakaparva* of the *Mahābhārata*. Here Pulastya appears as the expounder of the religious creed of pilgrimage. In the surviving extracts of the *Pulastyasmṛti* we have passages eulogising the religious merit of pilgrimage. On reaching a *mahātīrtha* there is no sin caused by lapse even in the case of eclipse

and funeral rites.[51] Special merit attaches to bathing in the rivers, particularly Gaṅgā, Sarayū, Irāvatī and Devikā, the confluences of rivers, and places near the Śivaliṅga.[52] Bathing at the confluence of big rivers and touching the waters of the sea are recommended for purification in the case of dog-bite.[53] In a *tīrtha* there is no impurity caused by death.[54] Gayā had come to be recognised as the foremost place for performing ancestral rites.[55] We must emphasise that the surviving quotations do not indicate that there was a separate chapter or section in the *Pulastyasmṛti* giving a full account of the various important *tīrthas*, the special acts or rites to be performed there, special occasions for a visit to the *tīrthas* and the religious merit which pilgrimage fetches.

Now, the question is: which came first, the *Tīrthayātrāparva* or the *Pulastyasmṛti*. Are we to suppose that the tradition as recorded in the *Tīrthayātrāparva*, which honoured Pulastya as the introducer of the religious practice of pilgrimage, was the main reason compelling the author of the *Pulastyasmṛti* to include in his text verses referring to the religious merit accruing from bathing at a *tīrtha*? We may also consider a second possibility that, in attributing to Pulastya the credit for introducing the creed of pilgrimage, the author of the *Tīrthayātrāparva* was moved by a consideration of the presence of verses praising the sanctifying qualities of the *tīrthas* in the *Pulastyasmṛti*.

As there are no common verses in the two texts, we cannot maintain that one borrowed from the other. It is equally difficult to be positive about one being aware of the presence of the other. However, it is to be noted that if the *Pulastyasmṛti* had existed before the composition of the *Tīrthayātrāparva*, the author of the *Mahābhārata* chapters would have accommodated some verses from the Smṛti in his own text. But, this argument cannot be considered to be compelling. We know that the *Mahābhārata*, at many places, records the views of many ancient sages and thinkers. In the absence of the original writings of these celebrities we cannot be sure if the *Mahābhārata* reproduces their own words. Considering the same form of verses, similar terms, and identical style of presentation, we may infer that the *Mahābhārata*, even in recording views traditionally attributed to these people, used its own form of structure and style of presentation. The possibility of the

Pulastyasmṛti providing the basis for the *Tīrthayātrāparva* seems to be remote. We cannot be sure if there was an earlier text recording Pulastya's views about *tīrthayātrā* which has not survived the passage of centuries.

But, if the *Tīrthayātrāparva* preceded the *Pulastyasmṛti*, the author of the Smṛti text was under no obligation to incorporate in his own text verses occurring in the *Tīrthayātrāparva*. The *Tīrthayātrāparva* was, by no means, a composition from Pulastya's own pen. In composing an independent text the author of the *Pulastyasmṛti* would be inclined to avoid passages occurring in the *Tīrthayātrāparva*. He would instead prefer to formulate in his own way the views on different subjects. In doing so he would have been naturally influenced by the image of Pulastya's personality as preserved in the tradition.

We cannot rule out the possibility of the author of the *Pulastyasmṛti* being aware of the tradition crediting Pulastya with the introduction of the religious practice of pilgrimage. In any case the *Pulastyasmṛti* verses emphasising the religious sanctity of the *tīrthas* will refer to a period when the practice of pilgrimage had come into vogue.

Thus, the importance of the evidence of the *Tīrthayātrāparva* lies in offering a date before which we cannot place the *Pulastyasmṛti*. On the basis of "the frequent descriptions of the various *tīrthas*, and the frequency with which the personalities in the Epics are made to visit them" Dhairyabala P. Vora[56] suggests that "by the time of the final edition of the Epic, *tīrthayātrā* must have been a very popular practice". She considers the *Tīrthayātrāparva* to be a later interpolation added some time after the Christian era. Dr. Vora, thus, seems to be inclined to place the *Tīrthayātrāparva* in the range A.D.100-300. The *Pulastyasmṛti* may be placed in this time-bracket, or in its later half, or a little later.

5. Padmapurāṇa and Pulastyasmṛti

We notice a significant difference in the coverage of Dharmaśāstra topics in the *Vāmanapurāṇa* and the *Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa* of the *Padmapurāṇa*. In both the cases the narrator is Pulastya. In the *Vāmanapurāṇa* he addresses Nārada and in the *Padmapurāṇa* he expounds to Bhīṣma. We may explain the pattern in the

Vāmanapurāṇa in a number of ways. But the *Padmapurāṇa* structure definitely shows that it is based on the *Tīrthayātrāparva* of the *Āraṇyakaparva* of the *Mahābhārata*.

Further, the passages in the *Vāmanapurāṇa* occur casually and briefly and concern only some of the topics of Dharmaśāstra. As against this, in the *Padmapurāṇa* the Smṛti portions, though emboxed in the narratives, appear to have a distinct position. They are more detailed in their account and cover a larger number of Dharmaśāstra topics. In the *Padmapurāṇa* Pulastya deals with these topics as if they are regular subjects falling under his purview. Pulastya in the *Padmapurāṇa* appears as a recognised authority on Dharmaśāstra. This is an improvement upon the position in the *Mahābhārata*. Pulastya is not restricted to *tīrthayātrā;* he expounds on many important topics falling under the wide scope of Dharmaśāstra. The *Padmapurāṇa* will imply that the *Pulastyasmṛti* had long been in circulation. The *Padmapurāṇa* is taken by Kane [57] to have borrowed its Smṛti material before A.D. 1000. R.C.Hazra[58] suggests differing dates for the inclusion of the Smṛti portions in this Purāṇa. Those in the Ādi, Bhūmi, Brahma, Pātāla and Uttara Khaṇḍas are generally placed in the time-bracket of A.D. 900 to 1400. In the *Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa* Hazra proposes the dates A.D. 600-750 for chapters 7, 9-11, 15, 17 and 31, A.D. 800-900 for chapters 20, 25, 27-28 and 36, and A.D.1000-1400 for chapters 43-62 and 75 onwards. Hence, we may suggest, on the basis of the Dharmaśāstra portions in the *Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa,* that Pulastya had established himself as a Dharmaśāstra writer before the seventh century.

6. Internal Evidence

(i) *Development of Dharmaśāstra Literature-* There are indications that the text did not belong to an early stage in the history of the Smṛti literature. It presupposes a rich growth of the Smṛtis. By that time a number of schools had emerged. The Smṛtis had come to cover a wide range of topics. On account of their wide range and varying provisions the Smṛtis created the need for determining the propriety of the rules, which particular provision in a Smṛti is to be followed in view of the apparently conflicting views. The question of the authority, which the different Smṛtis possess, became a matter of discussion. In determining it an effort was made to trace the

source from which they had originated. It was felt that in many cases the seed of the Smṛti injunctions could not be traced in the Vedic texts.[59]

The text further says that the advice of those people steadfast in *dharma* is wholesome who contemplate about the meaning of the Dharmaśāstra and those who know the Vedas.[60] The Dharmasūtras and the early Smṛtis in listing the sources of *dharma* mention the memory and conduct of those who know the Vedas.[61] The conduct of the virtuous people *(śiṣṭācāra)* [62] or the virtuous conduct *(sadācāra)* [63] was also included in the list of the sources of *dharma*. Āpastamba [64] mentions the injunctions of those who know *dharma* to be authority. This could have served as the basis for the statement made in the *Pulastyasmṛti,* but is not actually identical with it. The present verse presupposes a rich Dharmaśāstra literature. In view of the diverse and, at times, conflicting provisions, the need for coordinating and synthesising the Smṛtis was felt. The Smṛti texts by themselves did not offer a clear direction.[65] They had to be interpreted by those who were well versed in the Dharmaśāstra texts to yield a proper meaning. The Dharmaśāstras had acquired a richness and respectability to be studied seriously by a group of scholars who came to be recognised as experts for these texts.

The surviving quotations do not concern any topic related to legal dispute or *vyavahāra.* If it is not a chance feature,[66] it may have an important bearing on the nature of the original *Pulastyasmṛti* and its probable date. We know that the later Smṛtis sometimes did not give a proportionate importance to the topics of *vyavahāra* and gave more coverage to *ācāra, prāyaścitta, śuddhi* and *śrāddha.* Such an attitude was possibly dictated by the fact that the coverage of *vyavahāra* in Manu and Yājñavalkya, followed by further elaboration in Nārada, Bṛhaspati and Kātyāyana, did not leave much scope and practical utility for their discussion by later, minor Smṛtis. Thus, the absence of verses dealing with *vyavahāra* in the *Pulastyasmṛti* may indicate that it belonged to a period later than the earlier Śmṛtis of Manu, Yājñavalkya, Nārada, Bṛhaspati and Kātyāyana.

(ii) *Kṛṣṇājinadāna* – Hemādri in his *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*[67] quotes the provisions about *kṛṣṇājinadāna* from two sources –

Pulastya and the *Viṣṇudharmottara*. The details of the procedure in the two are the same, the only difference being that whereas Pulastya lays down the provisions in prose, the *Viṣṇudharmottara* employs verses to present them.[68] Of the two, Pulastya seems to be earlier. The account in Pulastya is simple and direct. It is confined to the actual details of the procedure and does not contain any irrelevant or additional statement. It has the form of a regular chapter on a specific topic. As against this, the section in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* does not have a separate distinct existence. The account has been woven into the texture of the plan of the text by prefixing an introductory verse and inserting the words *bhūpa* and *rājendra* in the vocative case.

The two accounts are closely similar in respect of the details of the procedure and the words and expressions used. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* is encyclopaedic in nature. It takes material from diverse sources and, with some suitable changes, incorporates it in its structure. In doing so it does not care to acknowledge the source. The very fact that Pulastya chose to present his account in prose indicates that it was his own original formulation. This is significant, because the major part of the Smṛti is in verses. It was quite in order for the author of the Smṛti to lay down the procedure of the *dāna* in prose. The author of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* versifies the procedure. In this process he systematises and elaborates the provisions about the four pots to be placed in the four directions and the objects *(kṣīra, dadhi, ghṛta* and *kṣaura)* to be kept in them. In the *Pulastyasmṛti* they are lumped together without a proper demarcation of their specific contents.

Another difference is to be seen in respect of the description of the donee Brāhmaṇa. Pulastya says that he is to be *āhitāgni, sarvāṅga-sampūrṇa, patrasaṃyukta* and *vidvān*. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* adds that he is to be a *supāṭhaka, pravaktā, yājñika* and *smṛtivid*. In the *Pulastyasmṛti* the sentences to be uttered by the donor, while making the gift, and by the donee, while receiving it, are simple and appropriate to the occasion.[69] The *Viṣṇudharmottara* transforms the utterance of the donor into a verse[70] and adds that the donee is to recite the *mantra* , *Aditirdyauḥ* with *praṇava* prefixed to it, both in the beginning and at the end of the donation.[71]

The more significant change in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* relates

to the additional remark that the *dāna* is to be given along with cow, land and gold and that by making such a gift even a person who has committed all the sins attains Brahman.[72]

The comparative analysis of the provisions about *kṛṣṇājinadāna* in the two texts shows that Pulastya has to be placed before the *Viṣṇudharmottara*.

(iii) *Week -days-* Another possible indicator of the date of the *Pulastyasmṛti* is the verse which attaches special merit to bathing on Ravivāra, Aṅgāravāra and Śanivāra.[73] This shows the establishment of the practice of naming the week-days after the planets and viewing them as specially sanctifying.

Some scholars believe that the Indians borrowed the practice of naming week-days after planets from the Greeks. They hold that Indian texts mentioning the names of week-days after the names of planets cannot be dated before the end of the second century of the Christian era, when this practice was established among the Greeks.[74] According to Fleet,[75] Europe received the Jewish calendar of week-days in the third century and India received it from Europe.

But this cannot serve as a reliable indicator. "No one knows exactly when the week-days were named and who were the people that first employed the current names of the week-days".[76] The planetary week seems to have originated in Egypt and not in Greece. There is no definite evidence for its prevalence in Greece or any other European country before the second century B.C. Its introduction in Greece cannot be placed earlier than the first century of the Christian era.[77] The Sanskrit names of the week- days do not show any Greek influence nor are Greek names recorded in any ancient Sanskrit text.[78] Although the earliest inscription in India to mention a week- day is the Eran Stone Pillar Inscription of Budhagupta (Gupta era 165 = A.D.484),[79] literary evidence makes it extremely probable, if not certain, that the worship of the planets and knowledge of the week-days presided over by them was known to the Indians at least betwen 100B.C. and 100A.D.[80] There is no cogent argument against the indigenous origin of the system in India,[81] but we need not dismiss the possibility that the idea of arranging days into weeks was suggested by the practice in Babylon and Syria.

Thus, the reference to the names of week-days need not be taken as an indication of a later date for the text. An early date around the beginning of the Christian era cannot be dismissed as improbable on the basis of this argument. But, considering the absence of the practice in any early inscription, it would seem that the practice gained general currency in the Gupta period and hence a date in the later part of the Gupta period will seem to be more likely.

(iv) *Fourfold Classification of Sannyāsins*- The *Pulastyasmṛti* [82] lays down the procedure for the *antyeṣṭi* of four types of ascetics: *kuṭicaka, bahūdaka, haṃsa* and *paramahaṃsa*. This division of the ascetics[83] into four classes is to be found in the *Anuśāsanaparva* of the *Mahābhārata,* [84] *Vaikhānasasūtra* [85] and *Bhikṣukopaniṣad.* It is also found in Laghu-Viṣṇu,[86] Prajāpati [87] and *Agnipurāṇa.*[88] Hence the *Pulastyasmṛti* is to be dated not before the *Anuśāsanaparva* of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Vaikhānasasūtra.* It may be placed in the same period to which the Smṛtis of Laghu-Viṣṇu and Prajāpati belong.

(v) *Religious condition : Vaiṣṇavism and Religious eclecticism*-The extracts contain significant references to religious beliefs and practices, which can serve as an indication of the times to which the original text belonged. It is clear that the author regarded Viṣṇu as his favourite deity. A person is required to begin his day by offering his prayers to Viṣṇu. He should awaken Viṣṇu in the morning by sounding musical instruments.[89] To overcome various types of difficulties he should recite the names of Viṣṇu.[90] If a man talks to a *pāṣaṇḍin,* he should meditate on *bhagavān* Viṣṇu under the name of Acyuta and pray to him.[91]

The theory of the Avatāras of Viṣṇu seems to have been fully established. The Avatāras actually named are Rāma, Paraśurāma, Nṛsiṃha, Vāmana (Trivikrama), Balabhadra and Vāsudeva,[92] but, it is not likely that other incarnations had not been recognised. The author evidently accepted Viṣṇu as the supreme god (*sarvasarveśvara* [93] and *devadeva* [94]). The names of Viṣṇu include Kāma, Kāmapriya, Kānta, Kāmapāla , Hari, Ānanda, Mādhava Puruṣottama, Dāmodara, Keśava, Puṇḍarīkākṣa, Hṛṣīkeśa, Acyuta, Amṛta, Aparājita, Cakrin, Gadin, Śārṅgin, Khaḍgin, Ajita,

Adhipa, Nārāyaṇa, Jalaśāyin, Garuḍadhvaja, Ananta, Śārṅgadhara, Śrīdhara, Paryaṅkaśāyin, Jagatpūti, Śrīśa, Viśoka and Govinda.[95] Rāma is included in the list of Avatāras, but the various names of Viṣṇu (Mādhava, Dāmodara , Keśava, Hṛṣīkeśa, Cakrin, Gadin and Govinda) indicate that Vāsudeva was considered to be more important. All the three Rāmas, Rāma, Paraśurāma and Balarāma (Balabhadra), are mentioned as the Avatāras of Viṣṇu.[96]

It is clear from the provisions about *tripuṇḍra* that the concept of the trinity of Śiva, Viṣṇu and Brahmā was fully established [97]. We do not notice any indication of a sectarian animosity. On the contrary, the text, though regarding Viṣṇu as the supreme god, attaches great religious merit to taking bath at such a place in the Gaṅgā near which a Śivaliṅga is placed.[98]

Scholars have traced seeds of the concept of *avatāra* in the Vedic literature. According to P.V. Kane,[99] the theory of the *avatāras* of Viṣṇu had been prevalent some centuries before the Christian era. H.C.Raychaudhuri [100] places its clear formulation in the third century B.C. The theory seems to have grown and changed in course of time. There is no unanimity about the number of *avatāras* in various texts. The *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* [101] at one place admits that the *avatāras* of Viṣṇu are countless. Even in one single text we find different lists of *avatāras*![102] It is not possible to arrange various lists in a chronological order. The names in the lists seem to have been changed according to the personal faith of the compiler and the tendencies of his own region and times . At a certain stage the number of *avatāras* came to be standardised as ten. But, even then there was no unanimity about the names actually included in the list of ten *avatāras*. The important points of difference related to the inclusion of Buddha and the particular Rāma or Rāmas accommodated in the list.

The *Pulastyasmṛti* does not mention the number of *avatāras,* nor does it enumerate the names in any sequence. Hence we cannot argue on the basis either of the number of names actually mentioned or of the names that are absent. Thus, the absence of Buddha can be explained on the ground that even after Buddha was included in the list of the *avatāras* of Viṣṇu, a feeling of antagonism against him persisted in some quarters.[103]

The inclusion of Balarāma in the list of *avatāras* was the result

of the impact of the *caturvyūha* doctrine of the old Pāñcarātra system. The *vyūha* doctrine arose out of the deification of several Vṛṣṇī *vīras.* Of these Saṅkarṣaṇa or Balarāma was a more important person and, before the beginning of the Christian era, was worshipped independently over a wide area even outside the Vṛṣṇī circle.[104] His memory as an exponent of the Sātvata or Pāñcarātra system is preserved in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā.* Later the worshippers of Saṅkarṣaṇa possibly merged themselves with those of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa. In the *Mahābhārata*[105] Balarāma, under the name of Sātvata, is included in the list of *avatāras.* The *Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā,*[106] a Pāñcarātra text, mentions him as Ananta in its list of thirty-nine *vibhavas* (manifestions of the Supreme Being) which includes all the well-known *avatāras*. The *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* names Rāma Haladhara in only one of its four lists which enumerates twenty-two *avatāras.*[107] The late Smṛti text of Vṛddha-Hārīta[108] is among the earliest to include Balabhadra in a list of ten *avatāras,* but it differs from the more standard list of the *Varāhapurāṇa*[109] in omitting Paraśurāma and replacing Buddha by Hayagrīva. Jayadeva in his *Gītagovinda* accommodates Rāma Haladhara in the list of ten *avatāras* by identifying Kṛṣṇa with Viṣṇu himself. The growth of a tradition representing Saṅkarṣaṇa as an incarnation of Śeṣa or Ananta Nāga was possibly one of the factors which caused the removal of his name from the list of the *avatāras* of Viṣṇu. But, the main reason probably was the growth in the popularity of other *avatāras* in the times of the Gupta kings.[110] The name of Balarāma would seem to have been generally dropped from the list of the ten *avatāras* of Viṣṇu, prepared in the later part of the Gupta period, though it persisted for some time in the Pāñcarātra circles.

Besides Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, Paraśurāma was among the earliest to be recognised as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu. According to D.C. Sircar[111], he was conceived as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu some time after the second century A.D. The Nārāyaṇīya section in the Śāntiparva at one place refers to only four *avatāras,* but does not mention him;[112] at another place in the same section his name appears in a list of six *avatāras*![113] The lists of ten *avatāras* generally retain the name of Rāma Jāmadagnya or Rāma Bhārgava.[114] In some circles, it seems, Paraśurāma, though accepted as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu, did not

receive equal honour. As in the case of Buddha, he was not considered fit for worship. Vṛddha-Hārīta[115] says that a noble Vaiṣṇava is not to worship Bhārgava and Buddha in all the rites. Possibly, after the incorporation of Rāma-Dāśarathi among the *avatāras* of Viṣṇu, the conflict between the two Rāmas and the discomfiture of Paraśurāma in it signified his loss of prestige. Some of his acts and certain traits of his character could also have contributed to his lower prestige.

Rāma-Dāśarathi appears to have been late in being recognised as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu. R.G.Bhandarkar[116] suggested that the cult of Rāma came into existence about the eleventh century. But, subsequent researches have exposed the weakness in this theory.[117] No doubt the worshippers of Rāma did not organise themselves into an independent group in earlier times, but there is ample evidence to show that since the Gupta period Rāma was worshipped as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu. Kālidāsa in his *Raghuvaṃśa*[118] mentions Rāma as an incarnation of Hari. His *Meghadūta*[119] refers to the foot-print of Raghupati on the Rāmagiri and to the waters in the *āśramas* of Rāmagiri as being holy on account of Sītā bathing in them. Varāhamihira in the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*[120] provides rules about the making of Rāma's image. The name of Rāma Dāśarathi occurs in the earliest lists of *avatāras* in the *Mahābhārata,*[121] *Rāmāyaṇa*[122] and the *Purāṇas.*[123] In some lists the name of Rāma appears without any distinguishing appellation,[124] hence we cannot be sure about his identification either with Rāma-Bhārgava or with Rāma-Dāśarathi. In the light of the above we need not drag the date of a text to the early medieval period on the ground that it mentions Rāma-Dāśarathi as one of the incarnations of Viṣṇu; it could be pushed back as early as the Gupta period.

All the three Rāmas appear together in the *Pulastyasmṛti.* The classic appearance of the three together as *avatāras* of Viṣṇu is to be found in the *Gītagovinda* of Jayadeva. Paraśurāma, Rāma Dhanurdhara and Ananta (Rāma Haladhara) are included in the *Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*[125] in a list of thirty-nine *vibhavas* (manifestations of the Supreme Being). One of the lists in the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*[126] mentions the names of Rāma-Jāmadagnya, Rāma-Dāśarathi and Rāma-Haladhara among twenty-two *avatāras*. Among the early references to the three Rāmas together we may note

the passage in the Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śāntiparva.[127]

Considering the introduction of the name of Rāma-Dāśarathi and the retention of the name of Balarāma as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu we may place the *Pulastyasmṛti* in the later part of the Gupta period.

The *Pulastyasmṛti* recognises Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva as the three principal gods without any sectarian rivalry. It breathes an atmosphere of religious eclecticism and toleration. Traces of henotheism and monotheism can be detected in the Vedic literature. The first necessary stage in the formulation of the concept of *trimūrti* is the establishment of the superiority of these three over other gods. The Vedic pantheon is gradually transformed and paves the way for the emergence of these three gods. From very early times there was a tendency to bridge sectarian gulf and to bring about sectarian harmony and peace. The practice of making syncretic images projects that tendency.The syncretic images of Hari-Hara-Pitāmaha and Hari-Hara-Hiraṇyagarbha fuse together the three principal deities of the Brahmanical faith. The concept of *trimūrti* is a unique feature of Brahmanical religion. Though they possess separate personalities and character, the three are conceived as forming a wonderful happy Trinity. There is no clash in their nature and functioning. They have separate roles to perform, which merge to create a harmonious unity. Brahmā creates, Viṣṇu sustains and Rudra annihilates . One of the earliest expressions of this Trinity is to be found in the *Āraṇyakaparva* of the *Mahābhārata*.[128] In the *Mahābhārata* generally the three are represented as acting in unison, often without their separate functions being clearly demarcated.[129] In the Purāṇas the Trinity is more clearly noticed.[130] This seems to reflect the religious moods of the Gupta period. In the *Raghuvaṃśa*[131] Hari is eulogised as having a triple manifestation and salutation is offered to him first as the creator of the universe, then as its sustainer, and finally as its annihilator. In the *Kumārasambhava*[132] it is Brahmā Svāyambhuva who is designated as Trimūrti. Before creation he alone exists; later, for the differentiation of the three qualities, he assumes distinct forms. This type of development well suits the spirit of religious toleration, peace and harmony which is so eminently confirmed for the Gupta period by the numerous literary, epigraphic and numismatic evidence of the period.

Gaṅgā and Tīrthas-

An important feature of the religious beliefs of the times is the high regard for the Gaṅgā. One bathing in the Gaṅgā does not enter the *pretayoni*.[133] Gaṅgā removes the sins of ten births *(daśajanmāghahā)* and is known as the remover of sin *(pāpaharā)*.[134] A person, who performs bathing, charity and other acts in the Gaṅgā, even in a false manner for gaining profit, fame and honour, goes to heaven.[135] Special merit attaches to the recitation of the Sandhyā *mantra* in the Gaṅgā.[136] The bigger rivers are designated as *mahānadīs*.[137] By taking bath at the confluence of big rivers *(mahānadyāśca saṅgame)* a man is absolved of the contamination caused by dog-bite.[138] The expanded geographical horizon of the times is indicated by the provision that such a purification is obtained by touching the sea.[139] Evidently sea was known intimately and was associated with special religious efficacy. Certain highly sanctified *tīrthas* were known as *mahātīrthas*.[140]

P.V.Kane[141] controverts the suggestion that the institution of pilgrimage wes started by the Buddhists and Jains.[142] He points out that the importance of holy places, visiting them, and performing religious rites there were known in the *Brāhmaṇa* period. The term *tīrtha* occurs in the Ṛk and other *Saṃhitās* as signifying a road, a way or a ford in a river.[143] Even in the Dharmasūtras[144] it retains its earlier usage as a ford and does not seem to have acquired currency as the term for a place of pilgrimage.[145] Kane[146] points out that the *tīrthas* do not occupy a very prominent position in the the Sūtras and ancient Smṛtis like those of Manu and Yājñavalkya, but are highly lauded as superior even to the sacrifices in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*. The practice of pilgrimage as a religious rite possibly came into vogue from the third century of the Christian era.

The concept of *mahātīrthas* is also an indicator of a later development. After several places came to be recognised as holy *tīrthas*, the designation of *mahātīrtha* was applied to some to magnify their religious importance. The tendency has a parallel in the field of polity. Even a mighty emperor like Aśoka was satisfied with the ordinary title of *rājā*. The practice of using high-sounding titles like *rājātirāja*and *mahārāja* came into vogue with the foreign dynasties, particularly the Kuṣāṇas. In the Gupta period the title of *mahārāja* came to be used even by feudatories and petty rulers. The

reference to *mahātīrthas* may suggest a date in the later part of the Gupta period.

The confluences of rivers were recognised as sacred places from the Vedic times. In the *Ṛgveda* [147] itself there is an indication of the sacredness of the confluences of rivers. The confluence of Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī was considered to be the proper place for the performance of an *iṣṭi*. [148] The recognition of Prayāga as the foremost *tīrtha* was largely on account of the confluence of the Gaṅgā and Yamunā. This in its turn helped the tendency to attach sanctity to the confluences of other rivers. A *Khila* verse,[149] usually placed in *Ṛgveda* X.75, is the earliest known reference to the highly sacred character of the confluence of the Gaṅga and Yamunā. The *Rāmāyaṇa* [150] mentions the confluence of the two rivers, but does not say much about the greatness of Prayāga which is described in detail in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*.[151]

In view of the limited geographical horizon of the *Ṛgveda* scholars generally hold that Gaṅgā was not much known in those times.[152] In the *Nadīstuti* hymn[153] Gaṅgā is mentioned first among the rivers, but, as it occurs in the tenth Maṇḍala of the *Ṛgveda*, some scholars take it to refer to a later period. The only other reference in the *Ṛgveda* is the occurance of the word *Gāṅgyaḥ*, [154] which possibly means 'growing on (the banks of) the Gāṅgā'. From the *Manusmṛti* [155] it can be inferred that Gaṅgā had come to be recognised as being among the holiest. The position of Gaṅgā as the foremost river is indicated by the *Bhagavadgītā* [156] in which Kṛṣṇa identifies himself with Gaṅgā among the rivers. The eulogy of Gaṅgā and its purifying and sanctifying qualities find a prominent and detailed description in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*.[157]

The concept of the sacredness of sea is also an interesting development. It may be noted that whereas the Dharmaśāstras look down upon sea-vogage and people living near the sea, sea itself came to acquire a sacred character. We can notice an early expression of the holiness of sea in the *Śāṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa*.[158] Here *samudra* is mentioned in close association with *tīrtha* and as absorbing everything. But, *tīrtha,* described as *agādha* (unfathomable), evidently refers to rivers and not to places of pilgrimage. The sea receives the rivers. As the rivers were considered to be sacred, the sea, with which they merged, also came to acquire a holy character.

The Purāṇas mention the rivers flowing to the sea as sacred and, in the same context, describe the sea also as sacred.[159] The *Nāradīyapurāṇa* [160] eulogises sea as the king among the *tīrthas* and as the lord of the rivers.

In view of the portions dealing with the *tīrthas* and the eulogy of Gaṅgā and the sea the *Pulastyasmṛti* cannot be placed before the Gupta period.

Pāṣaṇḍins or Buddhists-

The provisions about purification, after one has come into contact with a *pāṣaṇḍin* and has spoken to him, reflects a period of bitter reaction against the growing number of heretics. They are not referred to by their specific name but are designated as *pāṣaṇḍins* (or *pāṣaṇḍāḥ*)[161]. The application of the term *pāṣaṇḍins* to heretics is a later usage. *Pāṣaṇḍa* originally meant a group or corporate body. Buddhism was the first in the religious circles to establish a Saṅgha or corporation of its monks. On account of this peculiar institution the Buddhists came to be designated *pāṣaṇḍins*. The original usage of the term does not imply any contempt.[162] But, in course of time in the hands of the orthodox schools the term came to signify a heretic, a hypocrite.

The *Pulastyasmṛti* provides us some details about the ideas and practices of the *pāṣaṇḍins*. They are said to have given up the duties based on the division of *varṇas* and *āśramas* as prescribed by the Śrutis and Smṛtis. They cause the intermixing of the *varṇas* *(varṇasaṅkartkarttāraḥ)* They speak ill of the rites and rituals as laid down by the *Ṛk, Yajus* and *Sāman Saṃhitās;* they do not have faith *(aprītiḥ)* in the Vedic rites. There is a repeated reference to their performing improper deeds *(vikarma).* They are persons of evil conduct *(duḥśīlāḥ,durācārāḥ)*. They have given up the performance of the sacraments *(vrātyāḥ saṃskāravarjitāḥ).* They praise the qualities of evil food *(duṣṭānnaguṇavādinaḥ)*. They proclaim that nothing else exists *(nānyadastīti vādinaḥ)*. They perform fake religious rites *(vaiḍālavratinaḥ).* They indulge in austerities without undergoing purification *(niḥśaucavakramatayaḥ.)* They are deluded *(vimohitāḥ*) and have lost the sense of proper conduct *(viveka*). Their wisdom is destroyed *(kṣīṇajñānāḥ).* When asked by friendly and kind learned people, they give replies full of distorted logic

(kūṭayuktisamanvita). They are conceited on account of their cunning reasoning *(yuktiprāgalbhyadurmadāḥ)* . They perform sinful acts thinking of Dharma *(dharma-buddhyā tataḥ pāpaṃ kurvanti)* and earn their living through the pretext of religion *(dharmavyājopajīvinaḥ)*. The verses are full of derogatory adjectives: fools *(mūḍhāḥ)*, mean people fit to go to the hell *(narakārhānrādhamāḥ)* men of sinful deeds *(pāpakarmāṇaḥ)* , conceited *(dambhikāḥ)*, wicked-minded *(śaṭhabuddhayaḥ)*, and resorting to devilish feelings *(āsuraṃ bhāvamāśritāḥ)*.

The Brahmanical tradition often contemptuously refers to the heterodox systems and schools as *nāstikas* and *pāṣaṇḍins*. The orthodox tradition did not tolerate those who did not believe in the existence of God and did not subscribe to the authority of the Vedas. But, in the present case we do not have a denouncing of the heretics in general. The verses do not leave any doubt about the identification of the *pāṣaṇḍins*. It is clear that here we have an account of the Buddhists, their beliefs and conduct. The expression *nānyadastīti vādinaḥ* refers to their being atheists. They opposed belief in the existence of God and the superiority of the Vedas. The expression may further be taken to refer to the Buddhist doctrine of void or *śūnyatā,* including both *pudgalaśūnyatā* and *dharmaśūnyatā.* Likewise, the use of the expression *duḥśīlāḥ* is not without a special significance. It may be a sarcastic allusion to the fact that though *śīla* (practical morality) occupies an important place in the Buddhist ethics, being one of the three sections of the Middle Way for achieving the final goal,[163] their conduct in the final analysis cannot be approved. Again, in the two expressions, *dharmabuddhyā tataḥ pāpaṃ kurvanti* and *dharmavyājopajīvinaḥ*, the term *dharma* has a special significance. In Buddhism *dharma* is one of the three *ratnas* and stands for the Buddhist religion. Here *dharma,* though apparently meaning righteous duty, may imply a veiled, ironical reference to Buddhism. The two expressions suggest the decline in the morals of Buddhist monks and refer to the wealth and prosperity which Buddhist establishments received in the name of *dharma.* Lastly, the text refers to the dexterity of the Buddhists in marshalling logic in support of their principles *(yuktiprāgalbhya).* It further says that the *pāṣaṇḍins* used false logic *(kūṭayukti)* to propound their doctrines. We know that in the early stages of its history Buddhism

did not apply itself much to arguments and logic. Later Buddhist scholars marshalled logic in support of their formulation of principles. Buddhism played a vital role in the development of logic as a discipline.

Thus, the presentation of the Buddhist system in the *Pulastyasmṛti* corresponds to a later stage in its history. Buddhism had gained enough following to be reckoned as a force. Its bitter criticism by the orthodox writers is an indication of its popularity. Its social views and behaviour could no longer be ignored as a matter concerning a small, limited group. Its philosophical views had come for a wide circulation. Besides its objectionable rites and behaviour the money which the Buddhist monks and monasteries were receiving also had acquired a notorious proportion.

Considering the evidence and arguments listed above we may place the *Pulastyasmṛti* in the group of later Smṛtis. Its religious life and practices seem to reflect the realities of the Gupta period, especially in its later part. Thus, we are inclined to place the text in the rough time-bracket of A.D.300-500, preferably the second half, A.D.400-500. This leaves enough margin for the text to gain recognition as a Dharmaśāstra authority at the hands of Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya and to be quoted by Viśvarūpa.[164]

(B) Importance of Pulastyasmrti

On account of the survival of the text in the from of scattered passages the contributions of the *Pulastyasmṛti* to the socio-religious system of the Dharmaśāstras has not been attempted. Now, that the available passages have been collected, we can formulate an estimate of its importance as a Smṛti text, howsoever incomplete it may be.

It is to be recognised that all the passages which have survived were considered to be significant provisions in the *Pulastyasmṛti.* Even on points on which we have similar provisions in some other Smṛts, the very fact that the medieval authors deemed it proper to reproduce the passage from the *Pulastyasmṛti* shows that these quotations were considered to have a specific significance as words of authority in the history of Smṛti injunctions.

Of these passages some seem to have possessed a special importance and have been quoted by several medieval writers. Here we would like to list the following passages:

II.1.4- astronomical conjunctions meritorious for bathing in a river; II.4.1-2- performance of *sandhyā* as obligatory; II.5.2- leaving remnants in eating; II.5.5- occasions when not to eat; II.6.13- intoxicating drinks; II.4.2-5- meritorious occasions for *dāna;* VII.9-10-removing impurity caused by dog-bite; X.5.1- *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa;* X.7.2- food to be offered in *śrāddha;* X.7.5-7- occasions for offering *piṇḍadāna;* X. 7-8- performance of separate *śrāddha;* X. 8.1- performance of *śrāddha* of *mātāmahas*.

Some of the passages have been reproduced more than once in the same text. They were considered authoritative and were used to support the Dharmaśāstric injunctions in a number of contexts.

It is interesting to note that some of the provisions in this Smṛti were taken to be authoritative even when they clashed with the injunctions in the earlier and major Smṛtis. Thus, Yājñavalkya prescribes sacrificial food, flesh and honey as offerings in *śrāddha* for all *varṇas*, but Pulastya provides that a Brāhmaṇa is to offer the hermit's food, a Kṣatriya and a Vaiśya flesh, and a Śūdra honey. Vijñāneśvara upholds the injunction in the *Pulastyasmṛti* as worthy of being followed.

The significance of some of the passages in the text is evident inasmuch as we do not find much parallel to them in other Smṛti texts. Among such passages the more important ones are:

I.1.nature of Smṛti authority; I.2- synthesis of *jñāna* and *karma;* II.1- bathing (*snāna*); II.2- *ahata* garments; II.5- meals (*bhojana*); II.6- intoxicating drinks (*madyāni*); III- *devapūjā*, V- *kṛṣṇājinadāna*; VI- purification (*śuddhi*); VII- *śuddhi* for dog-bite; VII- *śuddhi* for talking to a *pāṣaṇḍin*; IX- expiation (*prāyaścitta*); X.1- *antyeṣṭi* ; X. 2- *sūtaka*; X.7- *śrāddhadāna*; X.8- *śrāddha* for *mātāmaha*, and XI- funeral rites for ascetics.

The text, however, does not have any importance for legal history. There is hardly any topic of *vidhi* or law discussed in it; the entire work is devoted to a discussion of non-legal topics.

References

1. *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol.I (2nd edn.), p.517.
2. *Ibid.*. Pp.562-64.
3. *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1928, Pp.289-93.
4. Quoted by Aparārka, P.7.
5. Quoted in *Vīramitrodaya*, Paribhāṣāprakāśa. p.16.
6. I.4-5. The number becomes twenty if Śaṅkha and Likhita are counted separately and Yājñavalkya is also included.
7. I.12-15.
8. Quoted by Viśvarūpa on Yāj. I.4-5-
   नारदः पुलहो गार्ग्यः पुलस्त्यः शौनकः क्रतुः ।
   बौधायनो जातुकर्णो विश्वामित्रः पितामहः ॥
9. See Kane, *Op.cit.* Pp.303-4, f.n. 312-13.
10. Ouoted in *Smṛticandrikā*, I, P.1; *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, Dānakhaṇda, P.528; *Sarasvatīvilāsa*, p.13, *Vīrmitrodaya*, Paribhāṣāprakāśa, p.18 attributes these verses to *Prayogapārijāta* and *Madanaratna*.
11. Ouoted in *Vīramitrodaya*, Paribhāṣāprakāśa, P.18.
    नारदः पुलहो गार्ग्यः पुलस्त्यः शौनकः क्रतुः ।
    बौधायनो जातुकर्णो विश्वामित्रः पितामहः ॥
    व्यासः सनत्कुमारश्च शन्तुर्जनकस्तथा ॥
    जाबालिर्नाचिकेतश्च स्कन्दो लौगाक्षिकश्यपौ ।
    व्याघ्रः कात्यायनश्चैव जातूकर्ण्यः कपिञ्जलः ।
    बौधायनश्च काणादो विश्वामित्रस्तथैव च ॥
    पैठीनसिर्गोभिलश्चेत्युपस्मृतिविधायकाः ॥
    वसिष्ठो नारदश्चैव सुमन्तुश्च पितामहः ।
    विष्णुः कार्ष्णाजिनिः सत्यव्रतो गार्ग्यश्च देवलः ॥
    जमदग्निर्भारद्वाजः पुलस्त्यः पुलहः क्रतुः ॥
    आत्रेयश्च गवेयश्च मरीचिर्वत्स एव च ॥
    पारस्करश्चर्ष्यश्रृङ्गो वैजवापस्तथैव च ।
    इत्येते समृतिकर्तार एकविंशतिरीरिताः ॥
12. *Op. cit.*. P.447.
13. *Ibid*, P.448.
14. A Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya verse quoted by Aparārka (on Yāj, III. 29-30) enjoins the same *prāyaścitta* for touching Cāṇḍālas, Pukkasas, Mlecchas, Bhillas and Pārasīkas-
    चाण्डाल-पुक्कस-म्लेच्छ-भिल्ल-पारसीकादिकम् ।
    महापातकिनश्चैव स्पृष्ट्वा स्नायात्सचैलकम् ॥
    From the context it seems that Mleccha here is not a general term for

outlandish people. It has often been used for foreigners in general. There are epigraphic and literary references for its use for Greeks, Scythians, Huns and Muslims. It is not possible to determine the people mentioned here. Pārasīka may provide a clue, but we cannot be sure about the people actually denoted by the name and the period of their entry into India after which the verse in question was written. The Achaemenids do not seem to be intended here. Possibly the reference is to the Indo-Parthians or more likely to the Indo-Sassanians. In the latter case Vṛddha-Yājñavalkya will have to be placed in the sixth century or a little later.

15. Quoted by Jīmūtavāhana, *Dāyabhāga* (1829), P.298.
16. On *Yāj.* I.4-5.
17. On *Yāj,* III.29-30.
18. On *Yāj,* III.1-2, 6, 19.
19. *Op.cit.,* P.564.
20. Kane, *Op.cit.,* Pp. 507-8. Aṅgiras is to be placed long before Viśvarūpa. He is later than Manu and Śātātapa, earlier than Sumantu, and belonged roughly to the times of Śaṅkha. The late date of the *Prayogapārijāta* is not of any help for the present discussion.
21. Pulastya X.7.1.
22. Śrāddhatattva in *Smṛtitattva,* I, p.189.
23. Page 501.
24. *Pariśeṣakhaṇḍa,* Śrāddhakalpa, p.152.
25. *Kṛtyakalpataru,* Śrāddha, P.176.
26. *Vīramitrodaya,* Śrāddhaprakāśa, P.3.
27. Page 100.
28. Pulastya X.7.5-6.
29. Jivananda Vidyasagar, *Bṛhat-Parāśara-saṃhitā,* Part II, Pp.53-309.
30. L. Gopal, *Aspects of history of agriculture in ancient India,* Pp.21-29.
31. Kane, *Op.cit.,* Vol.I, Pp.465-66.
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.,* Vol, IV- Chronological table.
34. *Op. cit.,* Pp.459-65.
35. *Ibid.,* Pp.465-66.
36. The text claims to have 3300 verses.
37. Pulastya I.1.3.
38. *Caturvargacintāmaṇi,* Pariśeṣakhaṇḍa, Kālanirṇaya, P.285; *Puruṣārthacintāmaṇi,* P.268.
39. *Sacred Books of the East,* Vol. XXXII., P.276.
40. *Op.cit,,* I, p.488.

41. I.2.1-2.
42. On *Yāj* , III.57 (p.961).
43. Mokṣakāṇḍa, P.146.
44. On *Yāj,* III.205.
45. IX. 28-29.
46. *Op.cit.,* Vol. I, P.457.
47. Kane, *Op.cit.,* Pp. 451-52.
48. *Ibid.,* P.517, f.n. 607.
49. See *supra* f.n.8.
50. Kane, *Op.cit* ., I, Pp. 448-49, 458.
51. II.1.11.
52. II.1.4-10.
53. VII.2-3.
54. X.2.1.
55. X.7.8.
56. *Evolution of Morals in the Epics,* P.244.
57. *Op. cit.,* Vol. V, P.893.
58. *Studies in the Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs,* Pp.181-84.
59. Pulastya I.12-
    शाखानां विप्रकीर्णत्वात्पुरुषाणां प्रमादतः।
    नानाप्रकरणस्थत्वात्स्मृतेर्मूलं न लक्ष्यते॥
60. I.1.3.-
    धर्मेषु नियता ये च धर्मशास्त्रचिन्तकाः।
    वेदशास्त्रविदो ये च तेषां वचनमौषधम्॥
61. Gautama I.1-2; Manu, II.6.
62. Vasiṣṭha, I.4-6; Manu, II.6.
63. *Yaj,* I.7.
64. I.1.1.2- धर्मज्ञसमयः प्रमाणं वेदाश्च।
65. Parāśara I.23 regards different Smṛtis to be authoritative for different ages. Bṛhaspati, Saṃskāra 13 decries Smṛtis opposed to Manu. Vyāsa (Quoted in *Smṛticandrikā,* I, P.17) requires comparative responsibility and majority view to be taken into consideration- तस्माद्विरोधे धर्मस्य निश्चित्य गुरुलाघवम्। यतो भूयस्ततो विद्वान् कुर्याद्धर्मविनिर्णयम्॥ The Nibandhas attempt this exercise with ingenuity and skilful reasoning. The conflict between Smṛtis and Śruti or Sadācāra has been covered.
66. See *supra* section II.6.
67. Dānakhaṇḍa, Pp.703-5.
68. Other texts also lay down the procedure to be followed. See *Matsyapurāṇa* ch.205. But, it is apparent that the formulation

is independent.

69. सर्वगुणविशिष्टं कृष्णाजिनं ददामि; कृष्णाजिनं प्रतिगृह्णामि।
70. कृष्णाजिणं (नं) द्विजश्रेष्ठ सशिरो गृष्टिभिर्युतं।
ददामि प्रतिगृह्णीष्व प्रीयतां धर्मराडिति॥
71. अदितिद्यौरिति जपेत् प्रणवेनादिना ततः।
सप्रणवं मन्त्रं प्रतिग्रहाद्यन्तयोः प्रतिग्रहीता जपेत्॥
72. गोभूहिरण्यसंयुक्तं मार्गमेतद्ददाति यः।
सर्वपापकर्माणि सायुज्यं ब्रह्मणो व्रजेत्॥
73. II.1.3.
74. *ZDMG*, VOL. XXX, P.306.
75. *JRAS*, 1912, P.1039.
76. Kane, *Op.cit.*, Vol.I, P.444.
77. Dio's *Roman History* (Loeb Classical Library), Vol.III, Pp. 126-27; F.H. Colson, *The Week* (Cambridge, 1926); Sorton, *History of Science*, Pp. 76-77.
78. Kane, *Op. cit*,, Vol. V, P.682.
79. J.F.Fleet, *C.I.I.*, Vol. III, P. 89. It mentions Thursday as *Suragurordivasa*.
80. Kane, *Op. cit.*, Vol. V, Pp.680-82.
81. E.Sachau, *Alberuni's India*, Vol.I, Pp.214-15; Cunningham, *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XIV, Pp.1ff; S.Shamasastri, *ABORI*, Vol.IV, Pp.1-31; Kane, *Op. cit.*, Vol.V, P.685.
82. XI.
83. Kane, *Op.cit.*, II,Pp.938-42.
84. *Mbh.*, XIII. 141.89.
85. VIII.9.
86. IV.11.
87. Quoted by Aparārka, P.952.
88. Ch.161. 18.
89. III.3.5.
90. III.6-24.
91. VIII.4.6.
92. III.7.16,19.
93. III.12.
94. III.22.
95. VIII. 6-24.
96. VIII.7,19.
97. II.3.3-4.
98. II.1.6,7,9.
99. *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol.II, P.720.
100. *Early History of Vaiṣṇava Sect*, P.63.

101. I.3. 26- अवतारा ह्यसंख्येया हरेः सत्त्वनिधेर्द्विजाः।
102. *Mbh.*, XII. 326-337; III.256.49-72; *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, I.3; II.7; VI.8.
103. *Ramāyaṇa*, II.109.34- यथा हि चोरः स तथाहि बुद्धस्तथागतं नास्तिकमत्र विद्धि। See K.K. Gopal. "Nāradapurāṇa on Buddhālaya", *Purāṇam*, XXVI (1984), Pp. 21-32.
104. Schrader, *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*, P.48; D. C. Sircar, "Early History of Vaiṣṇavism" in *The Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. IV, Pp. 127-29. He is one of the earliest Brahmanical deities to be represented in art- S.B.Singh. *Brahmanical Icons in Northern India*, P.92.
105. (Gita Press) XII. 339.103-4- रामो दाशरथिश्चैव सात्वतः कल्किरेव च। See *infra* f.n.127.
106. See J.N. Banerjea, *Puranic and Tantric Religion*, Pp. 45ff.
107. I.3.23. See also VI. 8.18.
108. X.145-46.
109. IV.2. See also *Memoir of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 26, P.5 for an eighth century inscription from Mamallapuram containing this verse. Kṣemendra in his *Daśāvatāracarita* follows it.
110. We do not have any epigraphic reference to the worship of Balarāma in the Gupta period.
111. *Op. cit.*, P.135.
112. *Mbh.*, XII. 337.36- वाराहं नारसिंहं च वामनं मानुषं तथा।
113. *Mbh.*, XII. 326.71-92.
114. *Mbh.* (Gita Press), XII.339.104 (mentions him simply as Rāma). See *infra* f.n. 127. *Matsyapurāṇa*, XLVII. 237-48; *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, XCVIII.71-104.
115. X.146-नार्चयेद्भार्गवं बुद्धं सर्वत्रापि च कर्मसु।
116. *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and minor religious systems*, p .66.
117. According to Sita Ram Chaturvedi, *Vaiṣṇava Dharma* (in Hindi), P.55 the recognition of Rāma as an *avatāra* can be traced back to the first century B.C.
118. X. 73. See also I.10.
119. Verse 12- वन्द्यैः पुंसां रघुपतिपदैरङ्कितं मेखलासु।
Verse 1- जनकतनयास्नानपुण्योदकेषु।
120. LVIII. See also *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*, III.85.62-63.
121. XII. 326.71-92. But Rāma does not figure in *Mbh.*, III. 256. 49-72 (it mentions only Varāha, Nṛsiṃha, Vāmana and Kṛṣṇa).
122. It is generally believed that the divinty of Rāma is expressed only in Bālakāṇḍa and Uttarakāṇḍa which seem to have been later additions to the text.

123. *Matsyapurāṇa*, XLVII. 237-48;*Vāyupurāṇa*, XCVIII. 71-104.
124. *Harivaṃśa*, I.41; *Garuḍapurāṇa*, I.202. In Gītā X.21 Kṛṣṇa claims his identification with Rāma, the foremost among wielders of weapon.
125. See *Supra* f.n. 106.
126. I.3.20, 22,23.
127. *Mbh* (Gita Press), XII. 339.103-4-
वराहो नारसिंहश्च वामनो राम एव च।
रामो दाशरथिश्चैव सात्वतः कल्किरेव च ॥
The Critical edition does not accept the verse but places it as an insertion after XII.326.94 ab. Also *Mbh* (Gita Press), XII. 339, verse no. 2 between 76 and 77- रामो रामश्च रामश्च। The Critical edition regards these verses between 76 and 77 as later insertions after its XII. 326. 71.
128. *Mbh.*, III.256.47-
सृज्यते ब्रह्ममूर्तिस्तु रक्षते पौरुषी तनुः।
रौद्रीभावेन शमयेत्तिस्रोऽवस्थाः प्रजापतेः ॥
Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, P. 231 considers it to be a late passage, as it is the solitary passage about Trimūrti in the *Mahābhārata*.
129. S.Bhattacharya, *Indian Theogony*, P.356.
130. *Ibid.*, P.357.
131. X.16- नमो विश्वसृजे पूर्वं विश्वं तदनु बिभ्रते।
अथ विश्वस्य संहर्त्रे तुभ्यं त्रेधास्थितात्मने॥
132. II.4- नमस्त्रिमूर्तये तुभ्यं प्राक् सृष्टेः केवलमात्मने।
गुणत्रयविभागाय पश्चाद् भेदमुपेयुषे॥
133. II.1.7.
134. II.1.8.
135. II.1.10.
136. II.4.3.
137. VII.2.5.
138. VII.2.
139. VII.3.
140. II.1.11.
141. *Op.cit.*, Vol. IV, P.558, f.n.1253.
142. D.R.Patil, *Cultural History of Vāyupurāṇa*, P.334.
143. P.V.Kane, *Op. cit.*, P.554.
144. Gautama, XIX.14; Vasiṣṭha, XXII.12-सर्वे शिलोच्चयाः सर्वाः स्रवन्त्यः पुण्या ह्रदास्तीर्थान्यृषिनिवासा गोष्ठपरिस्कन्दा इति देशाः। Baudhāyana, III.10.12 substitutes ०निवासा गोष्ठ०.
145. In the *Viṣṇudharmasūtra*, II.16-17 *tīrthānusaraṇa* is included in the list of *sāmānyadharma*. But, this Dharmasūtra, also known as a Smṛti, is the latest among the Dharmasūtras and is generally dated to 300 B.C.-100 A.D.
146. *Op. cit.*, P.561.
147. VIII.6.281-सङ्गथे च नदीनाम्. The *Vājasaneya Saṃhitā* XXVI.15 reads *saṅgame* for *saṅgathe*.
148. *Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa*, XXV.10.15; *Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra*, XXIV.5-6.
149. *Tīrthacintāmaṇi* of Vācaspati, P.47; *Tristhalīsetu* of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, P.3-सितासिते सरिते यत्र संगते तत्राप्लुतासो दिवमुत्पतन्ति।
150. II.54.6.
151. P.V.Kane, *Op.cit.*, P.597.
152. R.C. Majumdar and A.D. Pusalker, *The Vedic Age*, P.246; M. L. Bhargava, *The Geography of Ṛgvedic India*, Pp.40-41.
153. *R.V.*, X 75.5-6.
154. *R.V.*, VI.45.31-उरुः कक्षो न गाङ्ग्यः।
155. VIII.92- तेन चेदविवादस्ते मा गंङ्गां मा कुरून्गमः।
156. X.31-स्रोतसामस्मि जाह्नवी।
157. Kane, *Op. cit.*, Pp.586-89.
158. II.9-समुद्रो वा एष सर्वंहरो यदोह्नारात्रे तस्य हैते अगाधे तीर्थे यत्सन्ध्ये तद्यथा अगाधाभ्यां तीर्थाभ्यां समुद्रमतीयात्ताट्टक् तत्।
159. *Vāyu*, 77.117- समुद्रगाः समुद्राश्च सर्वे पुण्याः समन्ततः। *Kūrma*, II.37.49-50 adds another line -
नद्यः समुद्रगाः पुण्याः समुद्रश्च विशेषतः।
160. Uttara, 58.19 –राजा समस्ततीर्थानां सागरः सरितां पतिः।
161. VIII.2, 3, 8, 9, 10 *(pāṣaṇḍāḥ)*, 16.
162. See Aśoka's Rock Edict V, VII, XII, XIII; Pillar Edict VI,VII- *pāṣaṇḍa* as a general term for a religious sect.
163. S.Soni,"Place of Sīla in Buddhism", *Mahabodhi*, LXXIII, Pp.137 f; G.S.P. Mishra, *The Age of Vinaya*, Pp.76 f.
164. See *supra* section III.1 and 2.

Chapter 4

The Pulastya-upasmṛti

In his monumental work *History of Dharmaśātra*[1], Kane recognises Pulastya as an author of a *Smṛti.* He has discussed the quotations from the *Pulastyasmṛti* occurring in later texts, but does not take any notice of a published *Pulastyasmṛti.* The *Dharmaśāstrasaṅgraha,* edited by Pandit Mahadeva Shastri Amarpurkar[2] contains twenty-eight *Smṛtis,* of which the *Pulastyasmṛti* is one. The *Smṛtisandarbha,* which aims at bringing together all available *Smṛti* texts, also prints the *Pulastyasmṛti* .[3] Though, in most cases, the publisher of the *Smṛtisandarbha* adopts the *Smṛti* text as published elsewhere, he prints the *Pulastyasmṛti* on the basis of a manuscript available in the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta. Evidently he does not borrow the text of the *Pulastyasmṛti* from the *Dharmaśāstrasaṅgraha.*

1. Content

The published *Pulastyasmṛti* has twenty-nine verses. To distinguish it from the earlier *Pulastyasmṛti*, surviving in the form of quotations, we designate it as the *Pulastya-upasmṛti.* The introductory verse in the printed text says that in Kurukṣetra the sages enquired from Pulastya about the different types (*prakāra) of dharma.* In his reply Pulastya refers to the five forms (*pañcadhā)* of *dharma.* In verse 3 these are stated to be *varṇadharma, āśramadharma, varṇāśramadharma, guṇadharma* and *naimittikadharma.* Verse 4 explains *varṇadharma* as referring to the rules relating to the *varṇas,* to wit, the *upanayana* of the first three *varṇas.* The *āśramadharma,* or the provisions concerning the *āśramas,* are illustrated by the topics of *bhikṣā* (begging) and *piṇḍa* (oblation to the dead) (verse 5). The definition and explanation of *varṇāśramadharma* are missing[4]. Verse 6 defines *naimittikadharma* as the rules which are laid down for both the *varṇas* and the *āśramas* together and mentions as example the rules about *prāyaścitta.* Verse

7 enumerates the four *āśramas* : *brahmacārī, gṛhastha, vāṇaprastha* and *bhikṣuka* .[5] It mentions *rājadharma* as the fifth form of *dharma.* There is no explanation of *guṇadharma* here. Evidently *rājadharma* has been mentioned here in place of *guṇadharma.* Verse 8 refers to the general rules (*sādhāraṇa dharma)* for the *varṇas* and the four *āśramas*[6] .

Verses 9 to 11 enumerate the duties of the four *varṇas, ijyā* (sacrifice), *adhyayana* (study) and *dāna* (gift) are mentioned as the duties common *(sāmānya dharma)* to the Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas. Verse 10 lays down the *ājīvana* (source of livelihood): for Brāhmaṇas[7] *yājana* (performing sacrifice for others) and *adhyāpana* (teaching), for Kṣatriyas providing protection to people, and for Vaiśyas cattle-rearing and agriculture. Serving *(suśrūṣā)* the *dvijas* in a descending order is mentioned as the duty of Śūdras. The occupations *(vṛtti)* open for a Śūdra are serving (*sevā)* the *dvijas* and crafts *(kārukarma).*

Verses 12 to 21 deal with the duties of the four *āśramas: brahmacārins* (12-14), *gṛhamedhins* (15-16); *vanavāsins* (17-18) and *parivrāṭs* (19-21) .

Verse 22 says that *ahiṃsā* (non-injury to others), *satyavāda* (truth-speaking), *satya* (honesty),[8] *śauca* , (purity), *dayā* (compassion) and *kṣamā* (forbearance) are the general duties (*sāmānya dharma)* alike for all the four *varṇas* and the ascetics. Verse 23 says that it is the duty of all the *varṇas* and the ascetics[9] to acquire the knowledge of the self *(svajñāna).* In this context the text mentions *adṛṣṭārtha, dṛṣṭārtha, ubhayārtha* and *nyāyamūla* (23b to 24a), which refer to the different types of meaning to be given to provisions in the Smṛtis. Two lines, which possibly were dropped by carelessness, explained *dṛṣṭārtha* and *adṛṣṭārtha.* The line illustrating *ubhayārtha* is slightly distorted (24b). Line 25a explains *nyāyamūla.* The text says that *dharma* is to be known from the Veda and Smṛtis (25b) and that the Smṛtis (*anuvāka)* lay down what is uttered in the *Śruti.* The eminent meaning is specified specially in the *Brāhmaṇas* and others (26). Verse 27 says that the meritorious meaning is to be specially seen. This meaning is to be followed by one who desires to have religious merit.

Verse 28, in a concluding strain, says that *dharma*, in its five forms, which is the cause of *śreyas* (spiritual merit) and *abhyudaya*

(worldly prosperity), has been pronounced. It is to be duly followed by a person seeking meritorious results.

Verse 29 prescribes the period of impurity caused by the death of a daughter [10].

2. Comparison with *Bhavisyapurāṇa* and *Agnipurāṇa*

As these topics are covered in other *Smṛtis* also, we may find parallels in them. But, considering the emphasis on certain points, the specific details about them and the expression and style, it will be a rewarding venture to compare the verses of the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* with the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* (hereinafter abbreviated as Bh. P.) I. 181 and *Agnipurāṇa* (abbreviated as A. P.) Ch.166. These two *Purāṇas* also deal with the fivefold *dharma* [11] and the nature of the *Smṛti* injunctions and their interpretation.

The introductory portions in the three sources differ because they prepare the setting according to the requirements of their cases. In Bh. P. Sumantu, requested by Śatānīka, introduces the dialogue between Aruṇa and Bhāskara or Āditya [12]. In A. P. Puṣkara is the narrator. In Bh. P. the introductory portion is the longest (nine verses). A. P. has just one line. Pulastya introduces the subject in two verses. Of these the narrative in Bh. P. is the fullest and the most logical. Śatānīka solicits from Sumantu a summarised account of five forms of *dharma*. For the details Sumantu refers to the dialogue between Aruṇa and Bhāskara. Aruṇa asks Bhāskara about *smṛtidharma*. Bhāskara describes *smṛtidharma* to be rooted in the *Vedas* and then explains the meaning of the two terms *smṛti* and *dharma*. In this connection he describes *dharma* to be of five kinds. Anūru (Aruṇa) expresses his interest in further details of the fivefold *dharma*. From what follows in the three sources it is clear that, though the main emphasis was on the fivefold *dharma*, the subject was equated with *smṛtidharma* and hence the narrative contained a reference to the validity of *Smṛti* injunctions and their different possible interpretations. In this respect Bh. P. alone offers the proper introduction which correctly provides the background for the subsequent fuller treatment of the concerned topics.

When we compare the verses in the introductory portions of the three sources, we find that 1b [13] and 2b [14] of Pulastya are parallel to 1a [15] and 2a [16] of Bh.P.

On the five forms of *dharma* Bh.P. has six verses (10 to 15), A.P. has eight lines (1b to 5a) and Pulastya has twenty verses (3 to 22). In a verse common to Bh.P. (10) and Pulastya (3), the five forms of *dharma* are listed as *varṇadharma, āśramadharma, varṇāśramadharma, guṇadharma* and *naimittikadharma* [17]. There is nothing parallel to it in the A. P. The following verse defining *varṇadharma* occurs in all the three sources (Bh.P. 11; A.P.1b-2a; Pulastya 4). Except for a minor variation in the first half of the first line [18], A.P. and Pulastya have the same reading. The second line in Bh.P. does not have any relevance for *varṇadharma* It is apparently connected with the description of *āśramadharma* [19]. As we suggest below in the restoration in the case of the description of *varṇāśramadharma* and *naimittikadharma* in A. P. and Pulastya, we find a parallel mistake on the part of the scribe of Bh.P. in defining *varṇadharma* and *āśramadharma*. He seems to have combined the first line of the verse defining *varṇadharma* with the second line explaining *āśramadharma* [20]. This is supported by the quotation from Bh.P. occurring in the commentaries of Kullūka and Maṇirāma. These sources give the second line of the verse on *varṇadharma* as follows:

Varṇadharmaḥ sa uktastu yathopanayanaṃ nṛpa .

The next verse defines *āśramadharma*. The reading in A.P. (2b-3a) and Pulastya (5) is identical [21]. The first line of the parallel verse in Bh.P. seems to have been subsequently dropped on account of the carelessness of the copyist. Kullūka and Maṇirāma quote its first line as follows:

Yastvāśramaṃ samāśritya adhikāraḥ pravartate.

The verse defining *varṇāśramadharma* occurs only in Bh.P. (12) [22]. The corresponding verse in A.P/ (3b-4a) and Pulastya (6) defines *nimittadharma* [23]. This possibly is due to a mistake on the part of the copyist, who dropped the second line of the verse defining *varṇāśramadharma* and the first line of the verse defining *nimittadharma* and fused the remaining lines to form the verse in question. Bh.P. has two verses defining *naimittikadharma* [24]. The verse defining *naimittikadharma* in A.P. and Pulastya possibly had originally combined the first and the fourth line of these two verses [25]. We may, thus, restore the original verse defining *varṇāśramadharma* in A.P. and Pulastya by combining A.P.3b

(= Pulastya 6a) with Bh.P. 12b [26].

Guṇadharma has been defined only in Bh.P.(13). The corresponding verse in A.P. (4b-5a) and Pulastya (7) explains *āśramadharma* a second time by enumerating the four *āśramas* [27]. The second part of the second line (5a) in A.P. reads *dharmaḥ syāt pañcadhā paraḥ*. This leaves a lacuna in the text and omits a reference to the *guṇadharma*. The corresponding reading in Pulastya is *rājadharmastu pañcamaḥ*. This is happier as it covers the fifth, the *guṇadharma*. The reference to *rājadharma* in place of *guṇadharma* seems to be based on Bh.P. which illustrates *guṇadharma* as the protection of the subject people by the anointed king [28].

Verses 8 to 21 in Pulastya are without any parallel in the other two texts. After referring to the classification of *varṇas* and *āśramas* alike into four, it goes on to describe separately the duties of the individual *varṃas*. Likewise, Pulastya (22) alone describes *sāmānya dharma* as applying to the people of the four *varṇas* and the *āśramas (liṅgins)*. These are *ahiṃsā, satyavāda, satya, śauca, dayā* and *kṣamā* [29].

Verses 23 to 27 in Pulastya have their parallel in A.P. 5b-9a and Bh.P. 16-32. In A.P. it has an abrupt beginning without any perceptible connection with the preceding verses. Pulastya tries to forge a connection by saying that for all the *varṇas* and *liṅgins* realisation in their heart of the knowledge of self *(svajñāna)* is the *dharma*(23a). It then goes on to enumerate the four as *adṛṣṭārtha, dṛṣṭārtha, ubhayārtha* and *nyāyamūla* (23b-24a). It does not mention the context to which these four refer, nor does it explain the meaning of the terms. It says that *vyavahāra* and *daṇḍadhāraṇa* are *ubhayārtha* (both *dṛṣṭārtha* and *adṛṣṭārtha)* and that if two meanings have equal application, there is *vikalpa* (option) which is declared to be *nyāyamūla* (rooted in *nyāya*) [30]. In A.P. it is stated that *dṛṣṭārtha* has been illustrated in describing the *ṣāḍguṇya;* according to the school of Manu, with reference to *mantra, yāga* etc. the *adṛṣṭārtha* is of three types (5b-6a). It then reproduces the two lines about *ubhayārtha* and *nyāyamūla*[31]. It can be easily seen that, whereas lines 23b-24a of Pulastya are missing in A.P., Pulastya has dropped lines 5b-6a of A.P. Possibly the original of these two texts had six lines, of which a set of two different lines have been dropped in each case on account of the carelessness of the scribe.

We can understand the real significance of these four (originally six) lines in Pulastya and A.P., if we compare them with the corresponding lines in Bh.P. This third text provides the necessary connecting link, background and details for understanding the other texts. After describing the fivefold *dharma*. Bh.P. says that *dharma* is to be determined in four ways (16). It lays down the procedure to be followed if the *dharma* clashes with *śāstras, vyavasthā* and *smṛtis* or if there is inner contradiction (17-20). The *śāstras* are generally taken to be of two types: prohibitive and preceptive *(niṣedhavidhirūpam)*(21). The *smṛtis* are arranged into five types, though sometimes they are said to be of three, four, two, one or many types. The five types of *smṛtis* are *dṛṣṭārtha, adṛṣṭārtha* or *ubhayārtha, nyāyamūla* and *anuvādasmṛti*. Verse 23 mentions only four, omitting *nyāyamūla*. But, Aruṇa, when requesting Āditya to explain the different types of *smṛtis,* mentions all the five types (24-26).

A comparison of the explanation of these terms given by Āditya in Bh.P. with those occurring in Pulastya and A.P. leaves no doubt that, in their efforts to summarise the explanations, the authors of A.P. and Pulastya have committed mistakes and caused confusion. Thus, the one-line explanation of *dṛṣṭārtha* in A.P.[32] is evidently based on the two verses in Bh.P. (27-28)[33]. Bh.P. in verse 29, on the authority of Manu, provides a very clear illustration of the *adṛṣṭārtha smṛti* [34]. In its cryptic one-line account of *adṛṣṭārtha*[35] A.P. clearly had Bh.P. verse in view, because it also specifically refers to the opinion of the school of Manu. The comparison of the lines dealing with *ubhayārtha* and *nyāyamūla* in the three texts is interesting. Bh.P. 30a illustrates *ubhayārtha* (earlier in the introductory portions the term used is *dṛṣṭādṛṣṭa)* by the provision to use a *daṇḍa* of *palāśa* . A.P. 6a and Pulastya 24b are evidently based on Bh.P., but, in an effort to introduce change and summarise, they have sacrificed the intelligibility of the original verses. This defect is more pronounced in the case of Pulastya 24b.

As regards the *nyāyamūla* type the best reading occurs in Pulastya 25a.[36] The reading in A.P. 7a[37] is similar, except for the reading *yāgamūlaḥ* in place of *nyāyamūlaḥ* [38]. The change can be explained with the help of Bh.P. 30b which is quite intelligible and provides an illustration of option *(vikalpa)* in the case of conflicting

provisions (*virodha)*. It does not contain a reference to the term for the fourth (*nyāyamūla)*. Possibly a line containing the name has been inadvertently dropped. It would seem that the author of A.P. did not copy the line from Pulastya. He had with him Bh.P. which employs the word *yāgo* in its illustration, and used it in place of *nyāya*.

The definition of *anuvādinī smṛti* is to be found only in Bh.P. 31. A.P. 7b-9a and Pulastya 25b-27 do not contain any such definition. They instead remark that *dharma* is prescribed in both the *Vedas* and the *smṛtis;* according to the school of Manu the *smṛtis* provide the translation (*anuvāda)* for the purpose of their being implemented [39]. The third line in A.P. and Pulastya yields two slightly differing meanings. According to A.P. the translation specially brings out the eminent meaning or the specifying meaning [40], whereas, according to Pulastya, the eminent meaning is specified specially in the *Brāhmaṇas* and others [41]. The last line says that according to the school of Manu this meritorious meaning is to be partially seen [42]. A.P. and Pulastya do not seem to have based their lines on the verse in Bh.P. The common source, from which the two derived information, possibly had these four lines about the significance of the *smṛtis* and their connection with the *Vedas*.

Pulastya 27b adds yet another line which says that meaning should be followed by one who desires to have religious merit. Such a line is not found in the other two texts.

A.P. does not stop with the verses on the *Smṛtis* and their meaning. It goes on to enumerate the forty-eight sacraments (*saṃskāras)*, through which a person attains the Brahmaloka (9b-16a). The other two texts do not refer to the sacraments.

At the end both Bh.P. 32 and Pulastya 27 have a verse which makes a concluding reference to the main topics covered in the preceding verses. Bh.P. refers to the summarised description of *dharma* and the definitions under it and ends with saying that Ravi narrated it thus[43]. Suiting its narrower scope Pulastya refers to fivefold *dharma,* which is the cause of spiritual merit and material prosperity, and urges people, who aspire for merit, to duly follow it [44]. This verse in Pulastya uses the expression *śreyobhyudaya-hetuka* to refer to the merit caused by the fivefold *dharma.* It is interesting to note that Bh.P. in verse 7 describes the fivefold *dharma*

to be *śreyobhyudayalakṣaṇa* and paraphrases the idea in verse 8. The influence of Bh.P. is thus visible.

Verse 29 of Pulastya does not occur in the other two texts. It does not have any direct connection with the topics covered in the three texts. It appears in the text abruptly, without any justification.

Thus, we see that though the three texts largely cover the same ground and have much in common in the treatment of the two main themes of the fivefold *dharma* and the different interpretations of the *Smṛti* injunctions, it cannot be established that one copies from another. In regard to the two themes Pulastya and A.P. are often in close agreement, though there are also marked differences in reading and significant omissions. Instead of labelling one as the borrower, it will be better to describe both as drawing upon the same common source.

When compared with these two, Bh.P. has a better form and a fuller narrative. In it the scheme of the chapter is more clearly pronounced and implemented; both the themes have a fuller and more proper introduction. The connecting link in the two parts of the narrative has also been effectively established. The fuller details about different points under the two themes stand in sharp contrast with the cryptic and often unintelligible verses in the other two sources. One can easily see in the other two sources an effort to bring about brevity and summarise the details. If Bh.P. is not the original, on which the other two drew, it was very near the original in form and spirit. The differences, often identical, which the other two have with Bh.P. version, suggest that Bh.P. was not the original. On the contrary it shows that it borrowed the details about the two themes from some other source. Its chapter begins as a dialogue between Śatānīka and Sumantu, but the details about the two themes are given in the course of the dialogue between Āditya and Aruṇa. The closing verse also refers to the provisions as having been laid down by Ravi (Āditya). Evidently the author of Bh.P. borrowed these portions from some other source. We are not in a position to trace the text which contained Ravi's version of the fivefold *dharma*. This account possibly circulated for a long time before being recorded in Bh.P.

3. Date

We can infer that *Pulastya-upasmṛti* was not far removed from the period of Chapter 166 of A.P. and possibly followed the composition of Bh.P. I, Chapter 181. The only other indication about the date is the reference to the views of the school of Manu (Pulastya 26, 27). The possibility that the school of Manu had a very early existence is not helpful in narrowing the range of date for the composition of Pulastya.

R.C. Hazra [45] who has made a special study of the *Smṛti* material in the *Purāṇas*, places the *Smṛti* chapters, which are original to the *Agnipurāṇa*, in the 9th century. Hazra remarks that there may be a few more chapters of the second type, but adds that they cannot be separated. The chapter under study cannot be said to have been completely borrowed from another source, though it has many similarities with the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* and the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. According to Hazra [46] *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* I, Chapter 181 is to be dated not earlier than A.D. 500 and not later than A.D. 1075. The *Pulastya -upasmṛti*, which belongs roughly to the period of the *Agnipurāṇa* chapter, as the two seem to draw upon the same source, and was possibly a little later than the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* chapter, may be dated around A.D. 650-700.

4. Pulastya-upasmṛti distinct from Pulastyasmṛti

In determining the date of the composition of the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* we may examine the significance of its verse 29 [47]. As we have pointed out earlier, it is not connected with the two main themes of the text and does not occur in the parallel portions of the *Agnipurāṇa* and *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. Possibly it did not form a part of the original text. The editor of the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* in the Gurumaṇḍala series *(Smṛtisandarbha)* realised it and has described it as an interpolation *(prakṣipta)*. But, as the verse appears both in the *Dharmaśāstrasaṅgraha* and *Smṛtisandarbha* editions, which evidently were based on two different manuscripts of the text, it may be suggested that the verse in question was added at a very early stage of the copying of the manuscripts of the text. We find that Aparārka [48] and Kamalākarabhaṭṭa [49] reproduce the verse as a quotation from Pulastya. An early copyist of the manuscript of the *Pulastya - upasmṛti*, aware of the quotation in the writings of Aparārka and

Kamalākarabhaṭṭa, possibly deemed it proper to suffix the verse to the text of the *Pulastya-upasmṛti*. But, then we will have to explain why the copyist selected only one verse to the exclusion of other verses of Pulastya, many of which are quoted by Aparārka and Kamalākrabhaṭṭa as well. Admittedly, there is no reasonable explanation of this particular verse being suffixed to the text of the *Pulastya-upasmṛti*. The copyist, who inserted this verse, evidently belonged to a period later than that of Aparārka, or even after that of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa.

We may consider another possible explanation of the occurrence of the particular verse. It seems from the quotations in medieval commentaries and digests that the original *Pulastyasmṛti* was by no means a small text. It possibly covered many topics that fall within the scope of a *Smṛti*. The portion dealing with the fivefold *dharma* and the interpretation of *Smṛti* injunctions formed a compact chapter and was possibly copied and preserved as a separate unit. At a later stage a copyist tried to preserve other surviving verses, but without achieving any lasting success. Whereas the other verses could not stick to the separate unit on *dharma* and *smṛtis*, the verse in question somehow had a charmed survival.

If all the surviving quotations and the printed *Pulastya-upasmṛti* formed part of an earlier original *Smṛti*, then the date of the original *Smṛti*, determined on the basis of the quotations, will hold good for the printed text also. The occurrence in the printed text of the verse under reference would suggest for it a date quite sometime before Aparārka. On the basis of the gradual acceptance of Pulastya as a *Smṛti* writer and the date of the texts containing quotations from Pulastya, we have suggested [50] the time bracket A.D. 300-500 for the original *Pulastyasmṛti*. This, then, will become the date for the printed text also.

Though there is nothing inherently improbable in it, the printed text does not appear to have formed part of the original text. It is to be noted that none of the verses quoted from the original *Pulastyasmṛti* in the later commentaries and digests occurs in the printed text [51].

If we treat the published *Smṛti* to be a separate text prepared later, we will have to explain how the name *Pulastyasmṛti*, used for the earlier *Smṛti*, came to be applied to it also. We will have to find a cogent explanation for the circulation of two separate texts under

the same name. It is well known that to distinguish two *Smṛtis* , attributed to the same ancient sage, one is prefixed with the adjective *vṛddha* , *bṛhad* or *laghu*. On this analogy it will be argued that our printed text, if it was composed later, should have been appropriately named as *Vṛddha* - or *Bṛhat-Pulastyasmṛti* .

But the objection is not unsurmountable. Though it is correct that the names of the Smṛtis were differentiated in the manner indicated above, it was not imperative and was not done in all cases. We have other examples of two or more *Smṛti* texts circulating under the name of a common ancient sage as their author. One such name is that of Uśanas. There are two separate *Smṛti* texts under his name[52]. S.C. Banerji has published a third known from manuscripts in the Deccan College collection[53]. The numerous verses attributed to Uśanas, which have survived in medieval commentaries and digests, indicate the possible existence of a fourth *Smṛti* under his name.

Thus, we may infer that the published *Pulastya-upasmṛti* was composed not along with or as part of the original *Pulastyasmṛti* , but some time after it.

5. Importance of the Pulastya-upasmṛti

The contents of this *Smṛti* will also suit the history of the development of *Smṛti* literature. As we have seen above, the two themes of the present *Pulastya-upasmṛti* are: a description of the fivefold *dharma* and a reference to the nature of the authority of *Smṛtis* and the different types of meaning given by them.

(a) *Fivefold dharma-* This *Smṛti* is unique in describing the fivefold *dharma*. None of the earlier Smṛtis mentions such a classification of *dharma*,[54] though they cover in their own way some or all of the different points connected with the fivefold *dharma*. Leaving the *Pulastya-upasmṛti*, one of the earliest references to the fivefold classification of *dharma* [55] is found in Medhātithi's commentary [56]. This is followed by other commentators of Manu, such as Govindarāja and Kullūka. Haradatta, in his commentary on the *Gautama-dharmasūtra* [57], also mentions the fivefold classification. The *Mitākṣarā*[58] refers to a sixfold classification of *dharma*, adding *sādhāraṇadharma* as the sixth. The sixfold

classification is mentioned by Hemādri [59], but without enumerating them. Though Pulastya does not enumerate six types of *dharma*, in verse 22 he lists the qualities under *sāmānya-dharma*, which is the same as the *sādhāraṇa dharma*, the sixth in the *Mitākṣarā* classification of *dharma*. On the basis of the reference to the fivefold *dharma*, we may place *Pulastya-upasmṛti* in the class of later *Smṛtis* , nearer in time and spirit to the phase of commentaries and digests.

It is to be noted that Medhātithi does not attribute the fivefold classification to any particular *Smṛti* . He refers to the expounders of *Smṛti (Smṛti-vivaraṇakāras)* as propounding them. Vijñāneśvara also is silent about the authority for the sixfold classification. Hemādri[60], Caṇḍeśvara[61], Kullūka and Rāghavānanda quote verses from the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* which deal with the different types of *dharma* . The *Smṛticandrikā* [62] reproduces some of these verses as from Sumantu. We do not have any *Smṛti* under the name of Sumantu containing these verses. Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa is apparently wrong in attributing the verses to Sumantu. The chapter in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* which contains these verses has the wider structure of interlocution between Sumantu and Śatānīka. For this reason Davaṇṇabhaṭṭa ascribes the verses to Sumantu and not to the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. Maṇirāma mentions the verses as occurring in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. This is opposed to the testimony of other commentators, such as Kullūka and Rāghavānanda. Moreover, the verses are not traceable in the extant *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. Unless it is suggested that the verses did occur in the original *Viṣṇupurāṇa* as well, but were dropped in course of time, we will have to take the attribution of the verses to the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* to be misconceived.

It is strange that the medieval commentaries and digests chose to quote the verses as from the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* and not from the *Pulastyasmṛti* . It is well known that the *Purāṇas* also came to acquire a status parallel to the *Smṛti* texts and their views and provisions were quoted with distinct respect. In some cases the commentaries and digests have exercised their option in favour of a *Purāṇa* text, though they had identical statements in some *Smṛtis* as well. In the present case an additional consideration could have been the minor and insignificant nature of the *Pulastyasmṛti*. The text was possibly not in wide circulation. As a later *Smṛti* text it does not seem

possibly not in wide circulation. As a later *Smṛti* text it does not seem to have acquired general popularity. When contrasted with it the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* seems to have acquired a profound respect as a text dealing with *dharmaśāstra* material. This is clear from the numerous quotations from the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* which have survived in commentaries and digests.

It is not to be inferred that the authors of the medieval commentaries and digests were ignorant about the occurrence of the verses on fivefold *dharma* in the *Pulastya-upasmṛti*. The earlier ones do not quote the verses, nor do they mention the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. Medhātithi, by referring to the authority of the expounders of *Smṛti,* shows that he borrowed his fivefold classification from a *Smṛti* text and not a *Purāṇa*. As the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* gained in prestige, it eclipsed the authority of the minor text, *Pulastya-upasmṛti,* and quotations from it came to replace the description and explanation of the fivefold *dharma*. If this point has any value as an indication of the date of the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* in relation to the chapter in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa,* we may infer that both belonged roughly to the same period and further that the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* has a case for being placed a little earlier than the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* chapter.

(b) *Authority of the Smṛtis* - The second theme of the present text, namely the nature of the authority of the *Smṛti*s and the different types of meaning assigned to their provisions, is not separate and distinct. It is intrinsically connected with the first theme. The two themes taken together form a unity of purpose for the text. Interpreted in this manner, the text will have one single theme, namely the *smārtadharma*. The first part of the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* describes the different parts of the *smārtadharma*. Its second part deals with the nature of the authority enjoyed by the *Smṛtis* and the different types of meaning which they yield. The planning of the chapter in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* brings out this point very clearly. Line 1b in the *Pulastya-upasmṛti* also makes a pointed reference to the types of *dharma* which have been received as *smārta*.

(c) Smartadharma as theme - In ancient texts *dharma* is generally divided into *śrauta* and *smārta* [63], though sometimes on the basis of the three sources of *dharma (śruti, smṛti* and *śiṣṭācāra),* it is divided into three, namely *śrauta*, *smārta* and *śiṣṭācāra* [64]. The *smārtadharma* is derivatively explained as that which is dealt with by the *Smṛtis (smṛtiśāstrāgata)* [65] and is said to be concerned with the *ācāra* (conduct) of the *varṇas* and *āśramas* and to contain *yamas* and *niyamas*. [66]

Thus, the significance of the present text in the class of *Smṛti* literature is that it is the first to take up the well defined task of describing *smārtadharma* (as contrasted with the *śrautadharma*) in its five forms, and also of emphasising the authoritative character of the *Smṛtis* and their provisions.

References

1. Vol. I, pp. 516-17.
2. Jñāna Darpaṇ Press, Bombay. Śaka Era 1805 (1883 A. D.) It has been reprinted, with introductory notes by Vachaspati Upadhyaya, Navrang, New Delhi 1982. The *Pulastyasmṛti* occurs in vol. II. Hereinafter it is mentioned as Amarpurakar edition.
3. Gurumandal series, no. LX. Published by Mansukh Rai More, Calcutta 1953, vol. IV, pp.2134-36. We refer to it as Gurumandal version.
4. *Varṇāśramadharma* relates to rules in which both *varṇas* and *āśramas* are taken into consideration. Possibly the first line of verse 6 introduced *varṇāśramadharma.* As it contained the word *nimittena,* an ignorant scribe took it to be connected with the definition of *naimittikadharma* and dropped the second line of the verse defining *varṇāśramadharma* and the first line of the following verse introducing *naimittikadharma.* Further, it is not unlikely that verse 8 aimed at explaining *varṇāśramadharma.*
5. Evidently here a few lines are missing. In verse 5 *āśramadharma* has already been defined *-uktā (sic.) āśramadharmastu.* Hence the expression *uktā āśramadharmastu* in the second line of verse 7 is redundant. Further, there is no parallel enumeration of the four *varṇas.*
6. Possibly verse 8 preceded verse 7.
7. The original verse does not use any word for Brāhmaṇas.
8. The use of the two expressions *satyavāda* and *satya* together implies a difference between the two. Hence *satya* may mean honesty, sincerity, truthfulness, faithfulness, virtue, uprightness.
9. *Varṇiliṅgin* signifies a hypocritical person who wears the marks or badges of or is disguised as a religious student. The expression *varṇiliṅginām* here is to be taken to signify *varṇinām liṅgināñca* of verse 22. *Varṇinām,* then, will refer to persons of the four *varṇas* and *liṅginām,* which means a religious student, a Brāhmaṇa ascetic, will refer to persons of the four *āśramas.*
10. Gurumandal edition reads *pradātā yām* for *pradattāyām.*
11. The *Agnipurāṇa* gives *varṇadharmādikathanam* as the title of the chapter. In the Gurumandal edition *(Smṛtisandarbha)* of the *Pulastyasmṛti* its theme is mentioned as *varṇāśramadharmavarṇanam.*
12. The *Smṛtisandarbha* (vol. IV, pp. 2119-33) publishes the *Aruṇasmṛti,* which is in the form of a dialogue between Aruṇa and Āditya. It has only Chapter I dealing with *pratigraha* and *prāyaścitta.* If it dealt with other topics, including *varṇadharma* and other forms of *dharma,* it

cannot be ascertained.

13. तांश्च धर्मान् प्रकारांश्च नो वद स्मार्तमागतम् ।
14. पञ्चधावस्थितं धर्मं शृणुध्वं मुनिसत्तमाः ।
15. पञ्च प्रकारं धर्मं मे वद स्मार्तं यथाक्रमम् ।
16. पञ्चधा वर्णितं धर्मं शृणु राजन् समासतः ।
17. In Bh.P. *vedadharma* is clearly a scribe's mistake for *varṇadharma.* Other variants in Bh.P. are *sa tatparaḥ* for *ataḥ param* and *yathā* for *tathā* in Pulastya.
18. A. P. has *varṇatvamekamāśritya* for *varṇamekam samāśritya.* Bh.P. agrees with A.P.
19. *Adhikāre* is a mistake for *adhikāraḥ.* The second line reads
    सवर्णाश्रमदण्डस्तु भिक्षादण्डादिको यथा।
20. We may conjecture the following restoration for two original verses in Bh.P :
    वर्णत्वमेकमाश्रित्य अधिकारे प्रवर्तते ।
    (वर्णधर्म : स विज्ञेयो यथोपनयनं त्रिषु॥)
    (यस्त्वाश्रमं समाश्रित्य पदार्थः संविधीयते।)
    स वर्णाश्रमदण्डस्तु भिक्षादण्डादिको यथा॥
    The fourth line can easily be corrected to read as follows:
    स उक्तः आश्रमधर्मः (or उक्त आश्रमधर्मस्तु) भिक्षापिण्डादिको यथा।
21. Pulastya has *-piṇḍādikam* for *-piṇḍādiko.*
22. *śramatvaṃ* may be a mistake for *-śrayatvaṃ* .
23. उभयस्य निमित्तेन यो विधिः संप्रवर्तते।
    नैमित्तिकः स विज्ञेयः प्रायश्चित्तविधिर्यथा॥
24. निमित्तमेकमाश्रित्य यो धर्मः संप्रवर्त्तते।
    नैमित्तिकः स विज्ञेयो जातिद्रव्यगुणाश्रयः॥
    एष तु द्विविधः प्रोक्तः समासादविशेषतः।
    नैमित्तिकः स विज्ञेयः प्रायश्चित्तविधिर्यथा॥
25. The quotation occurring in the commentaries of Kullūka and Maṇirāma also has only one verse of the following form:
    निमित्तमेकमाश्रित्य यो धर्मः संप्रवर्तते।
    नैमित्तिकः स विज्ञेयः प्रायश्चित्तविधिर्यथा ॥
26. उभयस्य निमित्तेन यो विधिः संप्रवर्त्तते।
    (स वर्णाश्रमधर्मस्तु दण्डाद्या मेखला यथा ॥)
27. A.P. reads *gṛhī* and *yatī* for the second and the fourth, which are mentioned as *gṛhastha* and *bhikṣuka* by Pulastya.

28. यथा मूर्धाभिषिक्तस्य प्रजानां पालनं परम् ।
Kullūka and Maṇirāma read *paripālanaṃ* for *pālanaṃ param.*

29. A.P. 16-17 enumerates eight *ātmaguṇas*, by possessing which a person goes to the highest place: *dayā, kṣaṃā, anasūyā, anāyāsa, maṅgalam, akārpaṇya, aspṛhā* and *śauca*. Only three *dayā, kṣamā* and *śauca* are common. Other names show significant variations.

30. तुल्यार्थानां विकल्पः स्यान्न्यायमूलः प्रकीर्तितः ॥ 24b

31. A.P. reads *yāgamūlaḥ* for *nyāyamūlaḥ*.

32. षाड्गुण्यस्याभिधाने यो दृष्टार्थः स उदाहृतः ॥ 5b

33. षाड्गुणस्य स्वरूपं तु प्रयोगात् कार्यगौरवात् ।
समयानामुपायानां योगो व्याससमासतः ॥27
अध्यक्षाणां च निःक्षेपः करणानां निरूपणम् ।
दृष्टार्थेयं स्मृतिः प्रोक्ता ऋषिभिर्गरुडाग्रज ॥28

34. सन्ध्योपास्तिस्तथा कार्या शुनो मांसं न भक्षयेत् ।
अदृष्टार्था स्मृतिः प्रोक्ता मनुना विनतात्मजा ॥29

35. स त्रेधा मन्त्रयागाद्यदृष्टार्थ इति मानवाः ॥ 6a

36. तुल्यार्थानां विकल्पः स्यान्नचायमूलः प्रकीर्तितः ।

37. तुल्यार्थानां विकल्पः स्याद् यागमूलः प्रकीर्तितः ।

38. विरोधे तु विकल्पः स्याद् यागो होमस्ततो यथा ।

39. वेदे तु विहितो धर्मः स्मृतौ तादृश एव च ।
अनुवादं स्मृतिः सूते कार्यार्थमिति मानवाः ॥

40. गुणार्थः परिसंख्यार्थो वानुवादो विशेषतः ।

41. गुणार्थः परिसंख्यातो ब्राह्मणादौ विशेषकः ।

42. विशेषदृष्ट एवासौ फलार्थमिति मानवाः ।

43. उक्तो धर्मश्च संक्षेपात् परिभाषा च तद्गता ।
तत्साधनं च देशादि इत्थमित्यब्रवीद् रविः ॥

44. उक्तः पञ्चविधो धर्मः श्रेयोऽभ्युदयहेतुकः ।

45. *Studies in the Puranic records on Hindu rites and customs*, pp. 185-86.

46. *Op. cit.*, p. 188.

47. सद्यस्त्वप्रौढबालायामन्यथा वत्सराच्छुचिः ।
प्रदत्तायां त्रिरात्रेण दत्तायां पक्षिणी भवेत् ॥

48. P. 908.

49. *Nirṇayasindhu*, p. 372.

50. See *supra* chapter III.A.(2)

51. We are alive to the possible criticism that this negative argument is open to the fallacy of *argumentum ex silentio*. As Pulastya has not been very widely quoted and topics, on which his special views have been noted, are limited, it may be argued that in comparison with other older and more renowned *Smṛti* authorities his verses on the five types of *dharma* and the interpretation of *Smṛtis* failed to receive recognition. But Hemādri, Caṇḍeśvara and Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa, who knew Pulastya, attribute the verses occurring in the printed *Pulastya-upasmṛti* to other sources.

52. *Dharmaśāstrasaṅgraha*, Ed. Jivananda, Calcutta 1876, Part I, pp. 497-501, 501-44.

53. Kane, *op. cit*, I, pp.266-70. S.C.Banerji has edited it in *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, XXXIX, 1959.

54. Hārīta, quoted by Caṇḍeśvara, *Kṛtyaratnākara* , Calcutta 1925, pp. 9-10, mentions four types of *dharma: pṛthagdharma, viśeṣadharma, samānadharma* and *kṛtsnadharma*.

55. Kane, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p.3 says about the sixfold classification in the *Mitākṣarā*: 'This classification appears to have been an ancient one'. But he does not record any early reference to it..

56. On Manu, II 25.

57. XIX 1.

58. On *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, I. 1.

59. *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, Vratakhaṇḍa, p. 5.

60. *Loc. cit.*

61. *Loc. cit.*

62. I, p. 6.

63. *Matsyapurāṇa*, 144. 30-31.

64. *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra*, I. 1. 1-4.

65. *Mbh.*, Anuśāsana, 141. 65.

66. *Matsyapurāṇa*, 144. 30-31. *Yama*, as distinguished from *niyama*, refers to one of the ten great moral duties which are always to be observed. *Niyama* refers to a minor observance which is not so obligatory as a *yama*.

Chapter 5

Pulastyasmrti : (Reconstructed)

संकेत-सूची

अप = अपरार्क
आभू = आचारभूषण
आम = आचारमयूख
कल्यास = कल्यापद्धर्मसर्वस्व
कातवि = कालतत्वविवेचन
कामा = कालमाधव
कामाका = कालमाधवकारिका
गप (आस) = गदाधरपद्धति (आचारसार)
चचि = चतुर्वर्गचिन्तामणि
जक = जयसिंहकल्पद्रुम
दार = दानरत्नाकर
दासा = दानसागर
धद्वैनि = धर्मद्वैतनिर्णय
धप्र = धर्मप्रदीप
निसि = निर्णयसिन्धु
नृप्रपा = नृसिंहीय-प्रयोगपारिजात
पुचि = पुरुषार्थचिन्तामणि
प्रत्र(प्राप्र) = प्रदीपत्रय (प्रायश्चित्तप्रदीप)
प्रपा = प्रयोगपारिजात
प्राम = प्रायश्चित्तमयूख
बाभ = बालंभट्टी
मुचि = मुहूर्तचिन्तामणि
विपा = विधानपारिजात
विश्व = विश्वरूप
वीमि = वीरमित्रोदय
शुकप्र = शुक्लयजुःशाखीय-कर्मकाण्डप्रदीप

श्राक = श्राद्धकल्पलता
श्राच = श्राद्धचन्द्रिका
श्रात = श्राद्धतत्व
श्रामं = श्राद्धमंजरी
संकौ = संस्कारकौस्तुभ
संप = संस्कारपद्धति
संरमा = संस्काररत्नमाला
स्मृच = स्मृतिचन्द्रिका
स्मृत = स्मृतितत्व
स्मृसा = स्मृतिसारोद्धार
स्मृमु = स्मृतिमुक्ताफल

पुलस्त्य-स्मृतिः

I (धर्मनिरूपणम्)

१ (धर्ममूलम्)

श्रौताणां कर्मणां क्लृप्तिः कल्पसूत्रं तदुच्यते।
तथैव गृह्यकल्पानां स्मार्तानामुपसंग्रहः ॥ १
शाखानां विप्रकीर्णत्वात्पुरुषाणां प्रमादतः।
नानाप्रकरणस्थत्वात्स्मृतेर्मूलं न लक्ष्यते।।२
धर्मेषु नियता ये वै[1] धर्मशास्त्रार्थचिन्तकाः।
वेदशास्त्रविदो ये च तेषां वचनमौषधम् ॥३

२ (ज्ञानकर्मसमायोगः)

ज्ञानकर्मसमायोगात्परं प्राप्नोति पूरुषः।
पृथग्भावान्न सिध्यन्ति उभे तस्मात्समाश्रयेत् ॥ १
ज्ञानं प्रधानं न कर्महीनं कर्म प्रधानं न तु बुद्धिहीनम्।
तस्मादुभाभ्यां तु भवेत्प्रसिद्धिर्न ह्येकपक्षो विहगः प्रयाति ॥२

II (आह्निकाचारः)

१ (स्नानम्)

ऊर्ध्वं नाभेः करौ मुक्त्वा यदङ्गमुपहन्यते।
तत्र स्नानमधस्तात्तु क्षालनेनैव शुद्ध्यति॥१
इन्द्रिये च प्रविष्टे स्यादमेध्यं यदि कर्हिचित्।
मुखेऽपि संस्पृश्य गतं तत्र स्नानं विशोधनम्॥२
रव्यंगारशनेवारैः स्नानं कुर्वन्ति ये नराः।
व्याधिभिस्ते न पीड्यंते मृगैः केशरिणो यथा॥३
पुष्ये च जन्मनक्षत्रे व्यतीपाते च वैधृतौ।
अमावा[2]स्यां तु नदीस्नानं पुनात्यासप्तमं कुलम्॥४
अष्टमीरेवतीयोगे तथा चैरावतेऽम्भसि।
श्रावणं समनुप्राप्य यत्र क्वचन सङ्गमे॥
सर्वा चतुर्दशी पुण्या देविकायास्तथाम्भसि।५
चैत्रकृ[3]ष्णचतुर्दश्यां यः स्नायाच्छिवसन्निधौ।
न प्रेतत्वमवाप्नोति गंगायां च[4] विशेषतः॥६
शिवलिंङ्गसमीपे तु मुच्यते सर्वकिल्विषैः।
ज्येष्ठमासे सिते पक्षे दशमी हस्तसंयुता॥७
दशजन्माघहा गङ्गा तेन पापहरा स्मृता।
आषाढ्यां सरयूयोगे श्रावण्यां सततं तथा॥८
शिवलिङ्गसमीपे तु यत्तोयं पुरतः स्थितम्।
शिवगङ्गेति विज्ञेयं तत्र स्नात्वा दिवं व्रजेत्॥९
कपटेनापि गङ्गायां स्नानदानादि कर्म यत्।
यो लाभख्यातिपूजार्थं कुर्यात् सोऽपि दिवं व्रजेत्॥१०
चन्द्रसूर्यग्रहे चैव मृतानां पिण्डकर्मणि।
महातीर्थे तु सम्प्राप्ते क्षतदोषो न विद्यते॥११

२ (वस्त्रधारणम्)

ईषद्धौतं नवं श्वेतं सदशं यन्न धारितम्।
अहतं तद्विजानीयात्सर्वकर्मसु पावनम्॥१

३ (त्रिपुण्ड्रकम्)

अग्निरित्यादिभिर्मन्त्रैः शुद्धं भस्माभिमन्त्रितम्।
शिवमंत्रेण तद्धार्यं मंत्रेणाष्टाक्षरेण वा॥१
गायत्र्या वाथ देवर्षे मन्त्रेण प्रणवेन[5] वा।
करोति शिवमन्त्रेण यस्त्रिपुण्ड्रं द्विजोत्तमः॥२
त्र्यक्षः शूलधरः सौम्यः शिवलोके महीयते।
अष्टाक्षरेण मन्त्रेण यः करोति त्रिपुण्ड्रकम्॥॥३
विष्णोः पदमवाप्नोति गायत्र्या मुनिसत्तमः[6]।
प्राप्नोति ब्रह्मणो रूपं प्रणवेन न संशयः॥४

४ (सन्ध्या)

सन्ध्यामिष्टिं चरुं[7] होमं च[8] यावज्जीवं समाचरेत्।
न त्यजेत्सूतके वाऽपि त्य[9]जन्गाच्छेदधो ग[10]तिम् ॥१
सूतके मृतके चैव संध्याकर्म न[11] संत्यजेत्।
मनसोच्चारयेन्मंत्रान्प्राणायाममृते द्विजः॥२
गंगायां शतसाहस्री।३

५ (भोजनम्)

अश्नीयात्तन्मना भूत्वा पूर्वं तु मधुरान्तकम्।
लवणाम्लौ तथा मध्ये कटुतिक्तादिकं ततः॥१

भोजनं तु निःशेषं कु[12]र्यात्प्राज्ञः कथञ्चन।
अन्यत्र दधिसक्त्वाज्यपललक्षीरम[13]ध्वपः॥२
भुक्त्वोच्छिष्टं समादाय सर्वस्मात्किंचिदाचमन्।
उच्छिष्टभागधेयेभ्यः सोदकं निःक्षिपेद्भुवि॥३
सकृत्पर्वणि सर्वस्य हविष्यं लघुभोजनम्।
न सायं नोपवासः स्यात्तैलामिषविवर्जितम्॥४
एकादश्यां न भुंजीत नारी दृष्टे रजस्यपि॥५
शङ्खशुक्तितरङ्गाश्च यच्चान्यत्पानभोजनम्।
दक्षिणेनैव गृह्णीयान्न वामेन कदाचन॥६

६ (मद्यानि)

पानसं द्राक्षमाधूकं खार्ज्जूरं ता[14]लमैक्षवम्।
म[15]धूत्थं सै[16]रमारिष्टं मैरेयं[17] नारिकेलजम्॥१
स[18]मानानि वि[19]जानीयान्मद्यान्येकादशैव तु।
द्वादशं तु सुरामद्यं सर्वेषामधमं स्मृतम्॥२
द्राक्षेक्षुट[20]ङ्कखर्जूरप[21]नसादेस्तु यो रस।ः
सद्योजातस्तु तं पीत्वा त्र्यहाच्छुध्येद्द्विजोत्तमः॥३

III (देवपूजा)

तेन द्रव्याण्यशेषानि प्रोक्ष्याचम्य पुनर्गृही।
ततः कर्माणि कुर्वीत सत्क्रियाश्च द्विजोत्तमः[22] ॥ १
पालाशं वटवृक्षोत्थमाश्वत्थं शाकवृक्षकम्।
मृत्तिकौदुम्बरं पीठं माधूकं च विवर्जयेत् ॥ २
भिन्नपीठानि वर्ज्यानि पितृदैवतकर्मणि।
अथ प्रातः उत्थाय शुचिर्भूत्वा विष्णुं विज्ञापयेत् ॥ ३
यदुद्यमादिकं कर्म तत्त्वया प्रेरितो हरे।
करिष्यामि त्वदाज्ञेयमिति विज्ञापनं मम ॥४
प्रातः प्रबोधितो विष्णो हृषीकेशेन यत्त्वया।
यद्यत्कारयसे कर्म तत्करोमि तवाज्ञया।
इति विज्ञाप्य स्तुत्वा वादित्रादिना प्रबोधयेत् ॥५
कामः कामप्रियः कान्तः कामपालस्तथा हरिः।
आनंदो माधवश्चैव कामसंसिद्धये जपेत् ॥ ६
रामः परशुरामश्च नृसिंहो विष्णुरेव च।
त्रिविक्रमश्चेत्यादीनि जप्यानि विजगीषुभिः ॥७
विद्यामभ्यसतां नित्यं जप्तव्यः पुरुषोत्तमः।
दामोदरं बन्धगतो नित्यमेव जपेन्नरः ॥८
केशवं पुण्डरीकाक्षमनिशं हि तथा जपेत्।
नेत्रबाधासु सर्वासु हृषीकेशं भयेषु च ॥ ९
अच्युतं चामृतं चैव स्मरेदौषधिकर्मणि।
संग्रामाभिमुखो गच्छन् संस्मरेदपराजितम् ॥ १०
चक्रिणं गदिनं चैव शार्ङ्गिणं खड्गिनं तथा।
क्षेमार्थी प्रवसन्नित्यं दिक्षु प्राच्यादिषु स्मरेत् ॥ ११
अजितं चाधिपं चैव सर्वसर्वेश्वरं तथा।

संस्मरेत्पुरुषो भक्त्या व्यवहारेषु सर्वदा ॥ १२
नारायणं सर्वकालं क्षुतप्रस्खलनादिषु।
ग्रहनक्षत्रपीडासु देवबाधासु सर्वदा ॥ १३
दस्युवैरिनिरोधेषु सिंहव्याघ्रादिसंकटे।
अन्धकारे तमच्छिद्रे नरसिंहमनुस्मरेत् ॥ १४
तरत्यखिलदुर्गाणि तापार्तो जलशायिनाम्।
गरुडध्वजानुस्मरणाद्विषवीर्यं प्रशाम्यति ॥ १५
स्नाने देवार्चने होमे प्रणिपाते प्रदक्षिणे।
कीर्तयेद्भगवन्नाम वासुदेवेति तत्परः ॥ १६
स्थापने वित्तधान्यादेरवधाने च दुष्टजे।
कुर्वीत तन्मना भूत्वा अनन्ताच्युतकीर्तनम् ॥ १७
नारायणं शार्ङ्गधरं श्रीधरं पुरुषोत्तमम्।
वामनं खड्गिनं चैव दुःस्वप्ने तु सदा स्मरेत् ॥ १८
एकार्णवादौ पर्यङ्कशायिनं च नरः स्मरेत्।
बलभद्रं संवृद्ध्यर्थं निराकर्मणि संस्मरेत् ॥ १९
जगत्पूतिमपत्यार्थी स्तुवन् भक्त्या न सीदति।
श्रीशं सर्वाभ्युदयिके कर्मण्यासु प्रकीर्तयेत् ॥ २०
अरिष्टेष्वप्यशेषेषु विशोकं च सदा जपेत्।
मरुत्प्रतापा(?-पाता-)ग्निजलबन्धनादिषु मृत्युषु।
स्वतन्त्रपरतन्त्रेषु वासुदेवं जपेद्बुधः ॥ २१
सर्वार्थशक्तियुक्तस्य देवदेवस्य चक्रिणः।
यद्वाऽभिरोचते कामस्तत्सर्वार्थेषु कीर्तयेत् ॥ २२
सर्वार्थसिद्धिमाप्नोति नाम्नामेकार्थता यतः।
सर्वाण्येतानि नामानि परस्य ब्रह्मणो न वा ॥ २३
कुत्र तिष्ठति गोविन्दो बाह्यार्थहृतचेतसाम्।
तस्मान्निःसङ्गचित्तेन शक्यश्चिन्तयितुम् हरिः ॥ २४

IV (दानम्)

अयने कोटिगुणितं लक्षं च विषुवे फलम्।
षडशीत्या सहस्रं तु फलं विष्णुपदीषु च॥१
अयनांशयुतो भानुर्गोले चरति सर्वदा।
अमुख्या राशिसङ्क्रान्तिस्तुल्यकालविधिस्तयोः॥२
स्नानदानजपश्राद्धव्रतहोमादिकर्मभिः।
सुकृतं चलसङ्क्रान्तावक्षयं पुरुषोऽश्नुते॥३
सा[23]न्निहत्यमुपस्पृश्य राहुग्रस्ते दिवाकरे।
सत्रधर्मप्रवृ[24]त्तस्य दानकर्म फलैषिणः॥४
अकाले चेत् कृतं कर्म कालं प्राप्य पुनः क्रिया।
कालातीतं तु यत्कुर्यादकृतं तद्विनिर्दिशेत्॥५

V (कृष्णाजिनदानम्)

अथातः कृष्णाजिनदानविधिं वक्ष्यामः।१ कार्तिक्यां पौर्णमास्यां वैशाख्यां वा चन्द्रसूर्यग्रहे विषुवत्ययनयोर्वा कृष्णमृगाजिनं सखुरं सशृङ्गमव्रणं मनोहरं हिरण्यशृङ्ग रौप्यखुरं मुक्तालाङ्गूलभूषितं अन्तर्मांसम्बहिर्लोमं प्राक्ग्रीवं स्यात्। २ गोमयलिप्तायां भुवि कुतपानाविस्तीर्य तस्मिन्नाविकं वस्त्रं प्रसार्य तस्मिन्नजिनं हिण्यनाभं कृत्वा तिलैः प्रच्छाद्य तद्रूपं कृत्वा वस्त्रयुगेन तिलान् प्रच्छादयेत्। ३ चतसृषु दिक्षु चत्वारि पात्राणि ताम्ररौप्यकांस्यसौवर्णानि यथाशक्तितः पूर्वस्यान्दिशि क्षीरपूर्णं दक्षिणस्यान्दिशि दधिपूर्णं पश्चिमस्यान्दिशि घृतपूर्णम् उत्तरस्यान्दिशि क्षौद्रपूर्णन्निदध्यात्। ४ चतसृषु दिक्षु चरस्रो गृष्टी-र्निदध्यात्।५ पश्चिमे भागे सुसमिद्धमग्निं कृत्वा परिसमूह्य पर्युक्ष्य परिस्तीर्य प्रागग्रे दर्भे महाव्याहृतिभिस्तिलान् घृताक्तान् जुहुयात् शूद्रस्य नमस्कारेणेति। ६ तत आहिताग्नये ब्राह्मणाय सर्वाङ्गसम्पूर्णाय पात्रसंयुक्ताय विदुषे वस्त्रयुगोपच्छन्नायालङ्कृताय दद्यात् सर्वगुणाविशिष्टं कृ[25]णाजिनं ददामीति। ७ नाभिं स्पृशन्नदितये कृष्णाजिनं प्रति-गृह्णामीति असावपि गृह्णीयात् प्रतिग्रहं वाचयेत् । ८

VI (शुद्धिविचारः)

कण्ठं शिरो वा प्रावृत्य रथ्यापणगतोऽपि वा ।
अकृत्वा पादयोः शौचमाचान्तोऽप्यशुचिर्भवेत् ॥ १
स्नातकस्य त्रयोऽपाने पञ्चापानेऽग्निहोत्रिणः ।
सर्वानिवं गृहस्थेषु शौचकल्पान्नियोजयेत् ॥२

VII (पशुदष्टे शुद्धिः)

व्रतस्थं तु शुना दष्टं त्रिरात्रमुपवासयेत्।
सघृतं यावकं भुक्त्वा व्रतशेषं समापयेत्॥१
अव्रतः सव्रतो वाऽपि शुना दष्टो द्विजोत्तमः।
गवां शृङ्गोदकस्नातो महानद्याश्च संगमे॥२
समुद्रस्पर्शनाद्वापि शुना दष्टः शुचिर्भवेत्।
ब्राह्मणैः रहिते ग्रामे शुना दष्टस्तु ब्राह्मणः॥३
वृषं प्रदक्षिणीकृत्य प्राणायामेन शुध्यति।
श्वमृगालखरैर्दष्टो ग्राम्यैर्गोवायसैस्तथा॥४
प्रवाहेभ्यो महानद्याः प्राणायामशतं भवेत्।
घृतं प्राश्य विशुध्येत्तु त्रिरात्रोपोषणेन वा॥५
सुवर्णरजताभ्यां वा गवां शृङ्गोदकेन वा।
नवैर्वा कलशैः स्नात्वा चतुर्भिस्तु विशुध्यति॥६
ब्राह्मणी तु शुना दष्टा सोमे दृष्टिं निपातयेत्।
वेदविद्याव्रतस्नातः शुना दष्टस्तु ब्राह्मणः॥७
शतपर्यायमाव[26]र्त्य गायत्रीं शुद्धिमाप्नुयात्।
हिरण्योदकमिश्रं वा घृतं प्राश्य विशुध्यति॥८
रजस्वला यदा दष्टा शुना जम्बुकरासभैः।
पञ्चरात्रं निराहारा पञ्चगव्येन शुध्यति॥९
ऊर्ध्वं तु द्विगुणं नाभेर्वक्त्रे तु त्रिगुणं तथा।
चतुर्गुणं स्मृतं मूर्ध्नि दे[27]शेऽन्यत्राशु[28]चिर्भवेत्॥१०

VIII (पाषण्डिसंसर्गे शुद्धिः)

श्रुतिस्मृत्युदितं धर्मं वर्णाश्रमविभागजम्।
उल्लङ्घ्य ये प्रवर्तन्ते स्वेच्छया कूटयुक्तिभिः॥१
विकर्माभिरता मूढा युक्तिप्रागल्भ्य दुर्मदाः।
पाषण्डिनस्ते दुःशीला नरकार्हा नराधमाः॥२
तांस्तु पाषण्डिनः पापान्विकर्मस्थांश्च मानवान्।
बैडालव्रतिनश्चैव नित्यमेव च नाऽऽलपेत्॥३
संभाष्यैताञ्छुचिषदं चिन्तयेदच्युतं बुधः।
इदं चोच्चारयेद्भक्तया कृत्वा तत्प्रवणं मनः॥४
शरीरमन्तःकरणोपघातैर्वाचश्च विष्णुर्भगवानशेषम्।
शमं नयत्वस्तु ममेह शर्म पापादनन्ते हृदि सन्निविष्टे॥५
अन्तः शुद्धिं बहिः शुद्धिं शुद्धोऽन्तर्मम योऽच्युतः।
स करोत्वमले तस्मिञ्शुचिरेवास्मि सर्वदा॥६
बाह्योपघातादनघो विद्वांश्च भगवानजः।
शुद्धिं नयत्वन्तरा[29]त्मा विष्णुश्चेतसि संस्थितः॥७
एतत्संभाष्य जप्तव्यं पाषण्डिभिरिहाधमैः।
नमः शुचिषदे चोक्त्वा सूर्यं पश्येच्च वीक्षितैः॥८
पाषण्डिनो दुराचारा दुष्टान्नगुणवादिनः।
असंस्कृतान्नभोक्तारो व्रात्याः संस्कारवर्जिताः॥९
पाषण्डाः पापकर्माणो दाम्भिकाः शठबुद्धयः।
वर्णसङ्करकर्तारो धर्मव्याजोपजीविनः॥१०
निःशौचा वक्रमतयो नान्यदस्तीति वादिनः।
एवंविधास्ते सन्मार्गद्विदप्रोक्ताद्बहिष्कृताः॥११
क्रियाकलापं निन्दन्त ऋग्यजुःसामलक्षणम्।

आत्मानं च परांश्चैव कुर्वन्ति, नरकस्थितौ॥१२
तेषां दर्शनसंभाषस्पर्शनानि नरैः सदा।
परित्याज्यानि दृष्टे च प्रोक्तं संभाषणे तथा॥१३
संस्पर्शे च बुधः स्नात्वा शुद्धे(ध्ये)च्छुचिषदं स्मरन्।
अधमानां सदैवैषामालापस्पर्शनं त्यजेत्॥१४
प्राकृतोऽपि जनः किं तु यः सदाचारपालकः।
यतस्ते वैदिकं कर्म निन्दन्त्यकृतबुद्धयः॥१५
पाषण्डिनामशेषाणामप्रीतिर्वेदकर्मणि।
ते ह्यधोगामिनः प्रोक्ता आसुरं भावमाश्रिताः॥१६
तन्मोहितानामचिराद्विवेको याति संक्षयम्।
क्षीणज्ञाना विकर्माणि कुर्वन्त्यहरहर्नराः॥१७
निजवर्णात्मकं धर्मं परित्यज्य विमोहिताः।
धर्मबुद्ध्या ततः पापं कुर्वन्त्यज्ञानमोहिताः॥१८
ज्ञानावलेपस्तत्रैव ततस्तेषां प्रजायते।
सुहृद्भिर्वार्यमाणास्ते पण्डितैश्च दयालुभिः॥१९
प्रयच्छन्त्युत्तरं मूढाः कूटयुक्तिसमन्वितम्।
ततस्ते स्वयमात्मानमन्यं चाल्पमतिं नरम्॥२०
विकर्मणा योजयन्तश्च्यावयन्ति स्वधर्मतः॥२१

IX (प्रायश्चित्तम्)

स्त्रीणामर्धं प्रदातव्यं वृद्धानां रोगिणां तथा।
पादो बालेषु दातव्यः सर्वपापेष्वयं विधिः॥१
असंस्कृतो निरुत्साहो रोगी नवतिजीवकः।
यथाशक्ति प्रयुञ्जीत व्रतं ह्येषु न लुप्यते॥२

X (श्राद्धविधानम्)

१ (अन्त्येष्टिः)

दुर्मृतः सुमृतो वापि पिताग्रे यद्यसंस्कृतः ।
कालान्तरे मृता माता तस्या दाहादिकाः क्रियाः ॥१
पत्या सहैकचित्यां दहेदौपासनादुभौ ॥२

२ (सूतकविचारः)

अम्बुमध्ये गवां गोष्ठे तीर्थेष्वपि न पर्वसु ।
राहोर्दर्शनकाले च सूतकं नैव विद्यते ॥१
सद्यस्त्वप्रौढबा[30]लायां प्रौढायां वासराच्छुचिः ।
प्रदत्तायां त्रिरात्रेण दत्तायां पक्षिणी भवेत् ॥२

३ (तर्पणम्)

मनुष्यतर्पणं कुर्वन्न कंचिज्जानुमा[31]नमेत् ।१
अन्वाच्य दक्षिणं जानुं प्रागग्रैस्तु कुशैर्द्विजः ।
देवान् सन्तर्पयेन्नित्यं श्रद्धापूतेन चेतसा ॥२
अन्वाच्य जानुं सव्यन्तु कुशैश्च द्विगुणैरपि ।
सन्तर्पयेत् पितृन् भक्तया ध्यायंस्तद्गतमानसः ॥३
कृत्वा तर्पणमेवं तु समुत्तीर्य जलाशयात् ।
पीडयेत्स्नानशाटीं तु तट[33]एव विचक्षणः ॥४

४ (एकोद्दिष्टश्राद्धम्)

एकोद्दिष्टन्तु कर्तव्यं यावत्पित्रोः सपिण्डनम् ।
ततः सपिण्डनादूर्ध्वमेकोद्दिष्टं निवर्तते ॥१५

५ (सपिण्डीकरणम्)

निरग्निकः स[34]पिण्डत्वं पितुर्मातुश्च धर्मतः ।
पूर्णे संवत्सरे कुर्यादवृद्धिर्वा यद[35]हर्भवेत् ॥१

६ (पार्वणश्राद्धम्)

प्रत्यब्दमेतदेकस्य कुर्युः श्राद्धं सुता दश ।
अनग्निमानौरसं (?) च कुर्यात् साग्निस्तु पार्वणम् ॥१
पर्वकालो मृताहश्च यद्येकत्र द्वयम्भवेत् ।
पार्वणं तत्र कर्तव्यं नैकोद्दिष्टं कदाचन ॥२
अमायां वा क्षयो यस्य प्रेतपक्षेऽथवा भवेत् ।
पार्वणं तत्र कर्तव्यं नैकोद्दिष्टं कदाचन ॥३
पितृव्यभ्रातृमान्नृणामेकोद्दिष्टं न पार्वणम् ॥४

७ (श्राद्धदानम्)

संस्कृतं व्यञ्जनाढ्यं च पयोदधिघृतान्वितम् ।
श्रद्धया दीयते यस्मात् श्राद्धं तेन निगद्यते ॥१
मुन्यन्नं ब्राह्मणस्योक्तं मांसं क्षत्रियवैश्ययोः ।
मधुप्रदानं शूद्रस्य सर्वेषां चा[36]विरोधि यत् ॥२
वर्जयेद् दूरतः श्राद्धे यदप्रोक्षितमामिषम् ।

राजा(?ज्ञा)नुत्पादितं यच्च व्याधिनाभिहत[37]ञ्च यत् ॥३
श्रीपर्णी वारुणी क्षीरी जम्बुकाम्रकदम्बकम् ।
सप्तमं बाकुलं पीठं पितृणां दत्तमक्षयम् ॥४
युगादिषु मघायां च विषुवत्ययने तथा ।
भरणीषु च कुर्वीत पिण्डनिर्वपणं न हि ॥५
अयनद्वितये श्राद्धं विषुवद्वितये त[38]था ।
यु[39]गादिषु च स[40]र्वा[41]सु पिण्डनिर्व[42]पणादृते ॥६
एकादश्यां त्रयोदश्यां मघाकृत्तिकयोरपि ।
पिण्डदानं न कर्तव्यं पुत्रांश्च श्रियमिच्छता ॥७
महालये गयाश्राद्धे गतासूनां क्षयेऽहनि ।
तन्त्रेण श्रपणं कृत्वा श्राद्धं कुर्यात्पृथक्पृथक् ॥८

८ (मातामहश्राद्धम्)

मातुः पितरमारभ्य त्रयो मातामहाः स्मृताः ।
तेषां तु पितृवच्छ्राद्धं कुर्युर्दुहितृसूनवः ॥१

XI (संन्यस्तानां श्राद्धविधानम्)

प्रव्रजेद्यदि संसाराद्ब्रह्मविद्यापरायणः ।
कुटीचको भवेद्वाऽपि यद्वा चैव बहूदकः ॥१
हंसो भवेत्ततो ज्ञाने पर(म)[43]हंसस्ततोऽधिकः ।
एकदण्डी त्रिदण्डी वा मनोदण्डी तु नित्यशः ॥२
कुटीचकं तु प्रदहेत् पूरयेच्च[43] बहूदकम् ।
हंसं जले विनिक्षिप्य पर(म)[44]हंसं वि[45]दारयेत् ॥३
सपिण्डी[46]करणं नैव[47] सर्वेषां स्मृतिशासनात् ।
अहन्येकादशे प्राप्ते पार्वणं श्राद्धमाचरेत ॥४
पिण्डयज्ञं सुतः कुर्याद्दर्शश्राद्धं मृतेऽहनि ।
यतेर्महालये दर्शे वा तस्य मृतवासरे ॥५
पार्वणं स्यादितरेषामेकोद्दिष्टं तु वा भवेत् ॥६
संन्यस्तानां मृते देहे नाशौचं नोदकक्रिया ।
पदे पदेऽश्वमेधस्य वाहकस्य फलं भवेत् ॥७
विष्णुबुध्या परित्यज्य स्नात्वा गच्छेद्गृहं ततः ।
अशौचबुद्धया स्नातश्चेदिक्षुयंत्रं व्रजेन्नरः ॥८
कुटीचको बहूदश्च हंसः परमहंसकः ।
चतुर्विधानां भिक्षूणां एकदण्डित्रिदण्डिनाम् ॥९
षोडशानि नवश्राद्धं सपिण्डीकरणं न[48] च ।
एकादशेऽहनि प्राप्ते यदि वा द्वादशेऽहनि ॥१०
पार्वणेन विधानेन श्राद्धं कुर्यात्तदौरसः ।११

References

I. 1.1-2- नृप्रपा पत्र 3; आचारेन्दु (आचारप्रशंसा) 4.
I. 1.3- चचि, परिशेष, काल 285; युचि 268.
I. 2.1-2- अप 961.
II. 1.1-2- वीमि शुद्धि 137.
II.1.4, 3, 6-8a, 9- स्मृच आह्निक 122; 4-6- चचि, परिशेष, काल 709; 7b-8- चचि, परिशेष, काल 710; 4, 6, 8a- आम; 4- आचारेन्दु 52; 6- जक 589, निसि 68; 9- आभू 153; 10-11 प्रात 505.
II. 2.1- स्मृच आह्निक 113.
II. 3.1-4- आम 51, 65 (1, 2a); शुकप्र 162 (1, 2a).
II. 4.1-2- अप 893, 50 (1a, 2); स्मृच (आशौच) 74; चचि, परिशेष, काल 696, श्राकल 191, 195 (1), निसि 386, बालंभट्टी, प्रायश्चित्त 52 (1, 2), विपा (प्रथम) 247, 271 (1), आभू 88 (1), नृप्रपा 157 (1, 2) निर्णयामृत 269 (1, 2).
II. 4. 3- तीचि 222.
II. 5.1- शुकप्र 199.
II. 5.2-3- स्मृसा (दशम) 293, स्मृच (आह्निक) 224 (2), आम 110 (2), आभू 286 (2), आचारेन्दु 326 (2)
II. 5.4- स्मृच (आह्निक) 164.
II. 5.5- स्मृत (प्रथम) 109; पुचि 254, कामा 170, कामाका 33, निसि 34.
II. 5.6- वीमि (आह्निक) 71.
II. 6.1-3- अप (प्रायश्चित्त) 1075, मिताक्षरा III, 253; प्राम 101 (1,2), 104 (3); वीमि (शुद्धि) 137 (1, 2), कल्यास 399 (1, 2), स्मृसा 355 (1, 2), गप (आस) 408 (1, 2), प्रत्र (प्राप्र) 22 (1, 2).
III. 1- स्मृच (आह्निक) 155; चचि (श्राद्ध) 402.
III. 2-5- वीमि (पूजा) 96.
III. 6-23- स्मृच (आह्निक) 188-89.
III. 24- अप 970.
IV. 1- स्मृसा 155.
IV. 2-3- धप्र 10; मुचि 206, 208, 191 (3)
IV. 4- स्मृच (आशौच) 78; संकौ 62, नृप्रपा 158, श्राक 198.
IV. 5- स्मृच 162, संप 29, प्रप्रा 391, स्मृमु 15.
V. 1-8- चचि (दान) 703-5; दार 51a (1-2 upto मनोहरम्); दासा 48 (7-

सर्वगुणविशिष्टं ददामीति)

VI. 1- आम 22.

VI. 2- विश्व on I.17.

VII. 1-8- अप 1136

VII. 9-10-प्राम 217, अप 1136(9), संरमा 673 (1, 2)

VIII. 1-8, 9-16, 17-21- अप 171-72

IX. 1, 2- अप 1070.

X. 1.1-2- स्मृच (आशौच) 167; स्मृमु (चतुर्थ) 637.

X. 2.1- श्राक 200.

X. 2.2- अप 908, निसि 372.

X. 3.1- आभू 165, आचारेन्दु 221.

X. 3.2-3- चचि (परिशेष) 932.

X.3.4- स्मृच (श्राद्धिक) 112, चचि (परिशेष) 907.

X. 4.1- चचि (परिशेष) 1681.

X. 5.1- वीमि (समय) 220, निसि 426-27, धद्वैनि 76-77, पुचि 495, कातवि (द्वितीय) 495, चचि (श्राद्ध) 192.

X. 6.1-4- चचि (परिशेष) 1681.

X. 7.1- श्रात (स्मृत, प्रथम) 189.

X. 7.2- अप 555, मितांक्षरा I.260, श्राक 57, स्मृमु (चतुर्थ) 783, निसि 291..

X. 7.3- वीमि (श्राद्ध) 52-53; चचि (श्राद्ध) 373.

X. 7.4- निसि 303, श्राक 68.

X. 7.5-7- वीमि (समय) 174, 237 (6), वीमि (श्राद्ध) 319(6), श्राच 100 (5,6), स्मृसा 155, 194 (6), अप 426 (6), निर्णयामृत 190 (6), 204 (6), स्मृमु (चतुर्थ) 750, 761 (6), जक 158 (6), पुचि 460 (6), 483 (5b-6a), 485 (6), श्राक 86-87(6,7), निसि 72 (6), स्मृच (श्राद्ध) 23(6), 97(6), चचि (परिशेष) 501 (6), 587 (6), चचि (श्राद्ध) 148 (6), 218 (6).

X.7.8- वीमि (श्राद्ध) 318, चचि (परिशेष) 1691, निसि 344; शुकप्र (आह्निक) 289.

X. 8.1- स्मृच (श्राद्ध) 12, चचि (श्राद्ध) 53, 66 (1a), कातवि (द्वितीय) 388, धद्वैनि 98, निसि 335, श्रामं 17 (1a).

Variant Readings

1. पुचि- च
2. स्मृच, आम, आचारेन्दु drop -वा-
3. चचि जक- तु
4. चचि- शुक्लत्रयोद-
5. आम- -ण
6. आम- -म
7. आभू inserts च
8. चचि drops च
9. निर्णयामृत- यज्ञं नोच्छेदयेद्द्विजः
10. स्मृच, निसि- -द्विजः
11. स्मृच, निसि- समाचरेत्
12. स्मृसा - -मधूदकैः
13. स्मृसा - प्राज्ञः कुर्यात्
14. अप - कौ-
15. प्रत्र - माध्वीकं
16. गप (आस), कल्यास- सौ; प्रत्र - सान्नमाध्वीकं
17. प्रत्र --रे-
18. प्रत्र - सामान्येतानि; स्मृसा- सामान्यापि; वीमि- समानाति
19. प्रत्र - जानी-
20. Due to scribe's mistake we have -र- for -ट-। प्राय-ङ्कं खर्जूरं प-
21. प्राम - पानसादेश्च
22. चच - -माः
23. स्मृच - सन्निहृत्या-
24. स्मृच - -विष्ट-
25. दासा drops कृष्णाजिनं
26. MSS - -वृत्य
27. प्राम - दष्टे-
28. प्राम - -प्लुति-
29. अप drops -र-
30. निसि - -कन्यायां
31. आचारेन्दु- किं-
32. आचारेन्दु- -पातयेत्

33. स्मृच- -त
34. वीमि, चचि- सह्-
35. चचि- -दि वा भ-
36. निसि- वाऽ-
37. वीमि- -ताच्च
38. स्मृच 97- य-
39. श्राक, चचि 501- संक्रान्तिषु
40. पुचि- 460, निर्णयामृत, स्मृसा- कुर्वीत; श्राक, चचि 501- कर्तव्यं
41. स्मृच 97- -र्वे.-
42. स्मृच 23,97- -र्वा-.
43. The reading *parahaṃsa* is a mistake for *paramahaṃsa*. See v.5.
44. बाभ- त्तु
45. बाभ- प्रका-
46. बाभ- -ण्डनादि
47. बाभ - -वेषां स-
48. स्मृच- च न

Chapter 6

Pualstya-upasmrti (text)

पुलस्त्य-उपस्मृतिः

वर्णाश्रमधर्मवर्णनम्[क]

कुरुक्षेत्रे महात्मानं पुलस्त्यमृष्यो[1]ऽब्रुवन् ।
तांश्च धर्मान् प्रकारांश्च नो वद स्मार्तमागतम्[2] ॥१॥
एवं पृष्टः प्रत्युवाच सर्वांस्तान् पृच्छत[3] ऋषीन् ।
पञ्चधाव[4]स्थितं धर्मं शृणुध्वं मु[5]निसत्तमाः ॥२॥
वर्णधर्मः स्मृतस्त्वेक आश्रमाणामतः परम् ।
वर्णाश्रमस्तृतीयस्तु गुणनैमित्तिकस्तथा ॥३॥
वर्णमेकं समाश्रित्य योऽधिकारः प्रवर्तते ।
वर्णधर्मः स विज्ञेयो यथोपनयनं त्रिषु ॥४॥
यस्त्वाश्रमं[6] समाश्रित्य पदार्थः संविधीयते ।
उक्त आश्रमधर्मस्तु भिक्षापिण्डादिकं य[7]था ॥५॥
उभयस्य निमित्तेन यो विधिः संप्रवर्तते
(स वर्णाश्रमधर्मस्तु दण्डाद्या मेखला यथा ॥५अ॥
निमित्तमेकमाश्रित्य यो धर्मः संप्रवर्तते ।)[ख]
नैमित्तिकः स विज्ञेयः प्रायश्चित्तविधिर्यथा ॥६॥
ब्रह्मचारी गृहस्थश्च वानप्रस्थ[8]श्च भिक्षुकः ।
उक्त आश्रमधर्मस्तु राजधर्मस्तु पञ्चमः ॥७॥
वर्णधर्मश्चतुर्धा[9] तु आश्रमाणां तथैव च ।
द्वयोः साधारणो धर्मो यश्चासौ द्वयशेषभाक् ॥८॥
इज्याध्ययनदानानि यथाशास्त्रं सनातनम् ।

ब्रह्मक्षत्रियवैश्यानां सामान्यो धर्म उच्यते ॥९॥
याजनाध्या[10]पने राज्ञो भूतानां चाभिरक्षणम् ।
पाशुपाल्यं कृषिश्चैव वैश्यस्याजीवनं स्मृतम् ॥१०॥
शूद्रस्य द्विजशुश्रूषा द्विजानामनुपूर्वशः ।
शु[11]द्धा च वृत्तिस्तत्सेवा कारुता[12]रणकर्म(?) च ॥११॥
गुरौ वासोऽग्निशुश्रूषा स्वध्यायो व्रतधारण[13]म् ।
त्रिकालस्नायि[14]ता भै[15]क्ष्यं गुरौ प्राणान्तिकी स्थितिः ॥१२॥
तदभावे गुरुसुते तथा सब्रह्मचारिणि[16] ।
कामतो वा समानत्वं स्वधर्मो ब्रह्मचारिणः ॥१३॥
समेखलो जटी दण्डी मुण्डी[17] गुरुगृहाश्रयः ।
आ[18]विद्याग्रहणादगच्छेत्कामतो वाश्रमान्तरम् ॥१४॥
अग्निहोत्रोपचरणं जीवन[19]ञ्च स्वकर्मभिः ।
धर्मदानेषु काम्येषु सर्वत्र जनविक्लि[20]या (?) ॥१५॥
देवपित्र[21]तिथिभ्यश्च भूतानाम[22]नुकंपिता ।
श्रुतिस्मृत्युक्तसंस्कारो धर्मोऽयं गृहमेधिनः ॥१६॥
जटित्वमग्निहोत्रित्वं भूशय्याजिनधारणम् ।
वनेवासः पयोमूलनीवारकणवृत्तिता ॥१७॥
प्रतिग्रहनिवृत्तिश्च त्रिः[23]स्नानं मौनधार[24]णम् ।
देवतातिथिपूजा च धर्मोऽयं वनवासिनाम् ॥१८॥
सर्वारम्भपरित्यागो भैक्ष्यान्नं वृक्ष[25]मूलता ।
नि[26]ष्परिग्रहताद्रोहः समता सर्वजन्तुषु ॥१९॥
प्रियाप्रियपरिष्वङ्गः सुखदुःखप्र[27]कारिता ।
स बाह्याभ्यन्तरं शौचं नियमो व्रतकारिता ॥२०॥
सर्वेन्द्रियसमाहारो धारणाध्याननित्यता ।
भावशुद्धिस्तथेत्येवं परिव्राट्[28] धर्म उच्यते ॥२१॥
अहिंसा सत्यवादश्च सत्यं शौचं दया क्षमा ।

वर्णिनां लिङ्गिनां चैव सामान्यो धर्म उच्यते ॥२२॥
स्वज्ञानं हृ[29]दि सर्वेषां धर्मोऽयं वर्णिलिङ्गिनाम् ।
अदृष्टार्थश्[30]चैकविधः दृष्टार्थश्च द्वितीयकः ॥२३॥
उभयार्थस्तृतीयश्च न्यायमूलश्चतुर्थकः ।
उभयव्यवहार्यश्च दण्डधारणमेव च ॥२४॥
(षाड्गुण्यस्याभिधाने यो दृष्टार्थः स उदाहृतः ।
स त्रेधा मन्त्रयागाद्यदृष्टार्थ इति मानवाः ॥)[ग] २४अ॥
तुल्यार्थानां विकल्पः स्यान्न्यायमूलः प्रकीर्तितः ।
वेदे तु विदितो धर्मः स्मृतौ तादृश एव च ॥२५॥
अनुवाकः श्रुतिः[31] सूक्तं कार्यार्थमिति मानवाः ।
गु[32]णार्थः[33] परिसंख्यातो[34] ब्राह्मणादौ विशेषकः ॥२६॥
विशेषदृष्ट एवासौ फ[35]लार्थमिति मानवाः ।
तदर्थश्च प्रवा[36]सोऽयं स च सेव्यः फलार्थिना ॥२७॥
उक्तः पञ्चविधो धर्मः श्रेयोऽभ्युदयहेतुकः ।
पुरुषाणां यथायोगं स च सेव्यः फलार्थिना ॥२८॥
सद्यस्त्वप्रौढबालायामन्यथा वत्सराच्छु[37]चिः ।
प्रद[38]त्तायां त्रिरात्रेण दत्तायां पक्षिणी भवेत् ॥२९॥

इति श्री[39]पुलस्त्यप्रोक्तं धर्मशास्त्रं समाप्तम् ।

संकेत-सूची

अ = धर्मशास्त्र-संग्रह (सं० अमरपुरकर) में पुलस्त्यस्मृति
गु = स्मृतिसन्दर्भ (गुरुमण्डल सीरिज) में पुलस्त्यस्मृति
भ० पु० = भविष्यपुराण
अ० पु० = अग्निपुराण

Varient Readings

1. अ drops ऽ (*luptākāra* sign) at all places.
2. गु- ०म
3. अ- ०तो
4. गु- ०घा वा
5. गु- द्विज
6. गु- ०यं
7. गु- त०
8. अ- ०स्थोथ
9. गु- ०र्णा य०
10. गु- ०ध्ययने
11. गु- शूद्रा
12. गु- (कारुण्य) कर्म तथैव च। Possibly the reading was कारुकर्म तथैव च ।
13. गु- ०णि
14. गु- ०पि.
15. गु- भृत्यै
16. अ- णी
17. अ- ०ण्डो
18. गु- अन्यथा ग्रहण (corrected by editor as गृहमेधित्व)
19. अ- ०नं वस्व.
20. गु- ०क्रयाः । Possibly the reading was ०क्रि०
21. गु- ०त्र्य०
22. गु- ०मा०

23. अ- त्रि
24. अ- ०रिता
25. गु- ०त्त.
26. अ- निःप्रति(णि)हता
27. गु- ०वि०
28. गु- ०ड्
29. अ- ह्यधि
30. गु- ०र्थो द्विविधः (द्विधा) प्रोक्तो
31. गु- ०तिस्०
32. गु- omits 26b-27a.
33. अ- ०थ
34. अ- ०ता
35. अ- क०
36. गु- ०पा०
37. गु- ०च्छ०
38. गु- ०दाता या
39. गु- omits ०श्री

Notes

क- अ omits it. It begins with श्री गणेशाय नमः।
ख- Restored on the basis of भ० पु०
ग- Restored on the basis of अ

APPENDIX I-A

(अथ पर्वतदानविधानम्)[a]

[क]भीष्म उवाच ।

भगवन् श्रोतुमिच्छामि दानमाहात्म्यमुत्तमम् ।
यदक्षयं परे लोके देवर्षिगणपूजितम् ॥१

[ख]पुलस्त्य उवाच ।

मेरोः प्रदानं वक्ष्यामि दशधा मुनिसत्तम ।
यत् प्रसादान्नरो लोकानाप्नोति सुरपूजितान् ॥२
पुराणेषु य देवेषु यज्ञेष्वायतनेषु च ।
स तत् फलमधीतेषु कृतेष्विह यदश्नुते ॥३
तस्माद्विधानं वक्ष्यामि पर्वतानामनुत्तमम् ।
प्रथमो धान्यशैलः स्यात् द्वितीयो लवणाचलः ॥४
गुडाचलस्तृतीयस्तु चतुर्थो हेमपर्वतः ।
पञ्चमस्तिलशैलः स्यात् षष्ठः कार्पासपर्वतः ॥५
सप्तमो घृतशैलश्च रत्नशैलस्तथाष्टमः ।
राजतो नवमस्तद्वद्दशमः शर्कराचलः ॥६
वक्ष्ये विधानमेतेषां यथावदनुपूर्वशः ।
अयने विषुवे चैव व्यतीपाते दिनक्षये ॥७
शुक्लपक्षे तृतीयायां उपरागे शशिक्षये ।
विवाहोत्सवयज्ञे वा द्वादश्यामथवा पुनः ॥८
शुक्लायां पञ्चदश्यां वा पुण्यर्क्षे च विधानतः ।
धान्यशैलादयो देया यथाश्रद्धं विधानतः ॥९
तीर्थे वायतने वापि गोष्ठे वापि भवाङ्गणे ।
मण्डपं कारयेद्भक्त्या चतुरस्रमुदङ्मुखम् ॥

प्रागुदक्प्रवणं तद्वत्प्राङ्मुखो वा विधानतः ॥१०
गोमयेनोपलिप्तायां भूमावास्तीर्य वै कुशान् ।
तन्मध्ये पर्वतं कुर्यात् विष्कम्भपर्वतान्वितम् ॥११
धान्यद्रोणसहस्रेण भवेद्गिरिरिहोत्तमः ।
मध्यमः पञ्चशतिकः कनिष्ठः स्यात् त्रिभिः शतैः ॥१२
मेरुर्महाव्रीहिमयस्तु मध्ये सुवर्णवृक्षत्रयसंयुतः स्यात् ।
पूर्वेण मुक्ताफलवज्रयुक्तो याम्येन गोमेदकपुष्परागैः ॥१३
पश्चाच्च गारुत्मतनीलरत्नैः सौम्येन वैदूर्यसरोजरागैः ।
श्रीखण्डखण्डैरभितः प्रवाललतान्वितः शुक्तिशिलातलः स्यात् ॥१४
ब्रह्माथ विष्णुर्भगवान् मुरारिर्दिवाकरोऽप्यत्र हिरण्मयः स्यात् ।
मूर्द्धव्यवस्था गतमत्सरेण कार्याः सुवर्णेन तथा द्विजौघाः ॥१५
चत्वारि शृङ्गाणि च राजतानि नितम्बभागेष्वपि राजतः स्यात् ।
आर्द्रेक्षुवंशावृतकन्दरस्तु घृतोदकः प्रश्रवणश्च दिक्षु ॥१६
शुक्लाम्बराण्यम्बुधरावली स्यात् पूर्वेण पीतानि च दक्षिणेन ।
वासासि पश्यादथ कर्वुराणि रक्तानि चैवोत्तरतो घनाली ॥१७
रौप्यान्महेन्द्रप्रमुखानथाष्टौ संस्थाप्य लोकाधिपतीन् क्रमेण ।
नानाफलाली च समन्ततः स्यात् मनोरमं माल्यविलेपनं च ॥१८
वितानकं चोपरि पञ्चवर्णमम्लानपुष्पाभरणं सितं च ॥१९
इत्थन्निवेश्यामरशैलमग्र्यं मेरोश्च विष्कम्भगिरीन् क्रमेण ।
तुरीयभागेन चतुर्दिशन्तु संस्थापयेत् पुष्पविलेपनाढ्यान् ॥२०
पूर्वेण मन्दरमनेकफलैश्च युक्तं युक्तं गणैः

कनकभद्रककदम्बचिह्नम् ।
कामेन काञ्चनमयेन विराजमानमाकारयेत् कुसुमवस्त्र-विलेपनाढ्यम् ॥२१
क्षीरारुणोदसरसाथ वनेन चैव रौप्येण शक्तिघटितेन विराजमानम् ।
याम्येन गन्धमादनश्च निवेशनीयो गोधूमसञ्चयमयः कलधौतजं वा ॥२२
हैमेन यक्षपतिना घृतमानसेन वस्त्रैश्च राजतवनेन च संयुतः स्यात् ।
पश्चात्तिलाचलमनेकसुगन्धिपुष्पसौवर्णपिप्पलहिरण्मयहंसयुक्तम् ॥२३
आकारयेद्रजतपुष्पवनेन तद्वद्वस्त्रान्वितं दधिसितोदरसस्तथाग्रे ।
संस्थाप्य तं विपुलशैलमथोत्तरेण शैलं सुपार्श्वमपि माषमयं सवस्त्रम् ॥२४
पुष्पैश्च हेमवटपादपशेखरन्तमाकारयेत्कनकधेनुविराजमानम् ।
माक्षीकभद्रसरसा च वनेन तद्वद्रौप्येण भास्करवता च युतं विधाय ॥२५
होमैश्चतुर्भिरथवेदपुराणविद्भिर्दान्तैरनिन्द्यचरिताकृतिभिर्द्विजेन्द्रैः ।
पूर्वेण हस्तमितमत्र विधाय कुण्डं कार्यस्तिलैर्यवघृतेन समित्कुशैश्च ॥२६
रात्रौ च जागरमनुद्धतगीततूर्यैरावाहनं च कथयामि शिलोच्चयानाम् ॥२७

(अथ मेरोरावाहनमन्त्रः ।)

त्वं सर्वदेवगणधामनिधेर्विरुद्धमस्मद्गृहेष्यमरपर्वत नाशयाशु ।
क्षेमं विधत्स्व कुरु शान्तिमनुत्तमात्र सम्पूजितः परमभक्तिमता मया हि ॥२८
त्वमेव भगवानीशो ब्रह्मा विष्णुर्दिवाकरः मूर्त्तामूर्त्तपरं बीजमतः पाहि सनातन ।
यस्मात्त्वं लोकपालानां विश्वमूर्तेश्च मन्दिरं रुद्रादित्यवसूनां च तस्माच्छान्तिं प्रयच्छ मे ॥२९
यस्मादशून्यममरैर्नारीभिश्च समस्तथा
तस्मान्मामुद्धराशेषदुःखसंसारसागरात् ।
एवमभ्यर्च्य तं मेरुं मन्दरं चाभिपूजयेत् ॥३०

अथ मन्दरस्य

यस्माच्चैत्ररथेन त्वं भद्राश्वेन वर्षेण च ।
शोभसे मन्दर क्षिप्रमलं पुष्टिकरो भव ॥३१

अथ गन्धमादनस्य ।

यस्माच्चूडामणिर्जम्बूद्वीपे त्वं गन्धमादन ।
गन्धर्ववनशोभावानतः कीर्तिर्दृढास्तु मे ॥३२

अथ विपुलपर्वतस्य ।

यस्मात्त्वं केतुमालेन वैभ्राजेन वनेन च ।
हिरण्मयाश्वत्थशिखस्तस्मात् पुष्टिर्ध्रुवास्तु मे ॥३३

अथ सुपार्श्वस्य ।

उत्तरैः कुरुभिर्यस्मात् सावित्रेण वनेन च ।
सुपार्श्व राजसे नित्यमतः श्रीरक्षयास्तु मे ॥३४
एवमामन्त्र्य तान् सर्वान् प्रभाते विमले पुनः ।
स्नात्वाथ गुरवे दद्यात् मध्यमं पर्वतोत्तमम् ॥३५

विष्कम्भपर्वतान् दद्यादृत्विग्भ्यः क्रमशो नृप ।
गावो दद्याच्चतुर्विंशदथ वा दश पार्थिव ॥३६
शक्तितः सप्त वाष्टौ वा पञ्च दद्यादशक्तिमान् ।
एकां वा गुरवे दद्यात् कपिलां च पयस्विनीम् ॥३७
पर्वतानामशेषाणामेष एव विधिः स्मृताः ॥३८
ग्रहाणां लोकपालानां ब्रह्मादीनां च सर्वशः ॥
स्वमन्त्रेणैव सर्वेषु होमः शेलेषु पठ्यते ।
उपवासी भवेन्नित्यमशक्तौ नक्तमिष्यते ॥३९
विधानं सर्वशैलानां क्रमशः शृणु पार्थिव ।
दानकालेषु ये मन्त्राः पर्वतेषु च यत्फलम् ॥४०

अथ मन्त्रः ।

अन्नं ब्रह्म यतः प्रोक्तमन्ने प्राणाः प्रतिष्ठिताः ।
अन्नाद्भवन्ति भूतानि जगदन्नेन वर्तते ॥४१
अन्नमेव यतो लक्ष्मीरन्नमेव जनार्दनः ।
धान्यपर्वतरूपेण पाहि तस्मान्नमो नमः ॥४२

अनेन विधिना यस्तु दद्याद्धान्यमयङ्गिरिम् ।
मन्वन्तरशतं सार्द्धं देवलोके महीयते ॥४३
अप्सरोगणगन्धर्वैराकीर्णेन विराजितः ।
विमानेन दिवः पृष्ठमायाति सुरसेवितः ॥४४
कर्मक्षयाद्राजराज्यं प्राप्नोतीह न संशयः ॥४५

(अथ लवणाचलदानविधिः)[b]

अथातः संप्रवक्ष्यामि लवणाचलमुत्तमम्।
यत्प्रदानान्नरो लोकं[1] प्राप्नोति शिवसंयुत[2]म् ॥१

उत्तमः षोडशद्रोणः[3] कर्तव्यो लवणाचलः।
मध्यमः स्यात्तदर्द्धेन चतुर्भिरधमः स्मृतः॥२
वित्तहीनो यथाशक्त्या द्रोणादूर्ध्वं तु कारयेत्।
चतुर्थांशेन विष्कम्भपर्वतान् कारयेत् पृथक्॥३
विधानं पूर्ववत् कुर्यात् ब्रह्मादीनां च सर्वदा।
दद्वद्धेमत[4]रून् सर्वा[5]न् लोकपालनिवेशनम्।
सरांसि कामदेवादींस्तद्व[6]च्चात्र निवेशयेत्॥४
कुर्याज्जागरम[7]त्रापि दानमन्त्रान्निबोधत ॥
सौभाग्यर[8]ससम्भूतो यतोऽयं लवणो रसः।
तदा[9]त्मकत्वेन च मां पाहि पापान्नगोत्तम॥५
यस्मादन्नरसाः सर्वे नोत्कटा लवणं बिना।
प्रियं च शिवयोर्नित्यं तस्माच्छान्तिं प्रयच्छ मे॥६
विष्णुदेहसमुद्भूतं यस्मादारोग्यवर्द्धनम्।
तस्मात् पर्वतरूपेण पाहि संसारसागरात्॥७
अनेन विधिना यस्तु दद्याल्लवणपर्वतम्।
उमालोके वसेत्कल्पं ततो याति पराङ्गतिम्॥८[ग]

(अथ गुडपर्वतदानविधिः)[c]

अथा[10]तः संप्रवक्ष्यामि गुड[11]पर्वतमुत्तमम्।
यत्प्रदानान्न[12]रः स्वर्ग[13]माप्नोति सुरपूजितम्॥१
उत्तमो दशभिर्भारैर्मध्यमः पञ्चभिर्मतः।
त्रिभिर्भारैः कनिष्ठः स्यात्तदर्धेनाल्पवित्तवान्॥२
तद्वदामन्त्रणं पूजा[14]होमवृक्षसुरार्चनम्।
विष्कम्भपर्वतांस्तद्वत्सरांसि वनदेवताः॥३
होम[15] जागरणं तद्वल्लोक[16]पालाधिवासनम्।

धान्यपर्वतवत् कुर्यादिमं मन्त्रमुदीरयेत्॥४
यथा देवेषु विश्वात्मा प्रवरोऽयं जनार्दनः।
सामवेदस्तु वेदानां महादेवस्तु योगिनाम्॥५
प्रणवः सर्वमन्त्राणां नारीणां पार्वती यथा।
तथा रसानां प्रवरः सदैवेक्षुरसो[17] मतः॥६
मम तस्मात् परां लक्ष्मीं द[18]दस्व गुडपर्वत।
यस्मात् सौभाग्यदायिन्या भ्राता त्वं गुडपर्वत।
निवासश्चापि पार्वत्यास्तस्मान्मा[19] पाहि सर्वदा॥७
अनेन विधिना यस्तु दद्याद्गुडमयं गिरिम्॥
पूज्यमानः स[20] गन्धर्वैर्गौरीलोके महीयते॥ ८
पुनः कल्पशतान्ते[21] तु सप्तद्वीपाधिपो भवेत्॥
आयुरारोग्यसंपन्नः शत्रुभिश्चापराजितः॥९

(अथ सुवर्णाचलदानविधिः)[d]

अथ पापहरं वक्ष्ये सुवर्णाचलमुत्तमम्।
यस्य प्रदानाद्[22] भवनं विरिञ्चेर्याति मानवः॥१
उत्तमः पलसाहस्रो मध्यमः पञ्चभिः शतैः।
तदर्द्धेनाधमस्तद[23]ल्पवित्तोऽपि शक्तितः॥२
दद्यादेकपलादूर्ध्वं यथाशक्त्या विमत्सरः॥
धान्यपर्वतवत् सर्वं विदध्याद्रा[24]जसत्तम।
विष्कम्भशैलास्तद्वच्च ऋ[25]त्विग्भ्यः प्रतिपादयेत्॥३
यस्मादनन्तफलदस्तस्मात् पाहि शिलोच्चय॥४
नमस्ते ब्रह्मबी[26]जाय ब्रह्मग[27]र्भाय वै[28] नमः।
यस्मादग्नेरपत्यं त्वं य[29]स्मात् पुण्यं जगत्पते।
है[30]मपर्वतरूपेण तस्मात्पाहि नगोत्तम॥५
अनेन विधिना यस्तु दद्यात्कनकपर्वतम्॥

स याति परमं ब्र[31]ह्मलोकमानन्दकारकम्॥६
तत्र कल्पशतं तिष्ठेत् ततो याति पराङ्गतिम्॥७

(अथ तिलशैलदानविधिः)[e]

अथा[32]तः संप्रवक्ष्यामि तिलशैलं विधानतः।
यत्प्रदानान्नरो याति विष्णुलोक[33]मनुत्तमम्॥१
उत्तमो दशभिर्द्रोणैः प[34]ञ्चभिर्मध्यमो मतः।
त्रिभिः कनिष्ठो वि[35]प्रेन्द्र तिलशैलः प्रकीर्तितः॥२
पूर्ववच्चापरं[37] सर्वं वृक्षविष्कम्भकादिकम्।
दानमन्त्रान्प्रवक्ष्यामि यथावद्रा[37]जस[38]त्तम॥३
यस्मान्मधुवने[39] विष्णोर्देहस्वेदसमुद्भवाः॥
तिलाः कुशाश्च माषाश्च तस्माच्छ[40]न्नो भवत्वि[41]ह॥४
हव्य[42]कव्येषु यस्माच्च तिलै[43]रेवाभिलक्षणम्।
भवादुद्धर शैलेन्द्र तिलाचल नमोऽस्तु ते॥५
इत्यामन्त्र्य च यो दद्यात्तिलाचलमनुत्तमम्।
स वैष्णवं पदं याति पुनरावृत्तिदुर्लभम्॥६
दीर्घायुष्य[44]मवाप्नोति इ[45]ह चामुत्र मानवः।
पितृभिर्देवगन्धर्वैर्पूज्यमानो दिवं व्रजेत्॥७

(अथ कार्पासपर्वतदानविधिः)[f]

[g]कर्पासपर्वतस्तदु विंशभारैरिहोत्तमः।
दशभिर्मध्यमः प्रोक्तः कनिष्ठः पञ्चभिः स्मृतः॥१
भारेणाल्पधनो दद्याद्वित्तशाठ्यविवर्जितः।
धान्यपर्वतवत्सर्वमासाद्य राजसत्तम॥२
प्रभातायान्तु शर्वर्यां दद्यादिदमुदीरयेत्।
त्वमेवाचरणं यस्माल्लोकानामिह सर्वदा॥३

कर्पासाचल तस्मात्त्वमघोघध्वंसनो भव।
एवं कर्पासशैलेन्द्रं यो दद्यात् पर्वसन्निधौ॥
रुद्रलोके वसेत्कल्पं ततो राजा भवेदिह॥४

(अथ घृतपर्वतदानविधिः)g

अथा[14]तः सम्प्रवक्ष्यामि घृत[47]शैलमनुत्तमम्।
तेजोऽमृतमयन्दिव्यं महापातकनाशनम्॥१
विंशत्या घृतकुम्भानामुत्तमः स्यात् घृताचलः।
दशभिर्मध्यमः प्रोक्तः पञ्चभिर[48]धमः स्मृतः॥२
अल्पवित्तः[49] प्रकुर्वीत द्वाभ्यां मेरुविधानतः।
विष्कम्भपर्वतांस्तद्वच्चतुर्भागेन[50] कल्पयेत्॥३
शालितण्डुलपात्राणि कुम्भोपरि निवेशयेत्।
कारयेत् संहतान्[51] सर्वान् यथाशोभं विधानतः॥४
वेष्टयेत्[52] शुक्लवासोभिरिक्षुदण्डफलादिकैः।
धान्यपर्वतवच्छेष[53]विधानमिह पठ्यते॥५
अधिवासञ्च[54] कुर्वीत दद्वद्धोम[55] सुरार्चनम्॥६
प्रभातायान्तु शर्वर्यां गुरवे वि[56]निवेदयेत्।
विष्कम्भपर्वतांस्तद्वदृत्विग्भ्यः शान्तमानसः॥७
संयोगात् घृतस[57]मुत्पन्नं यस्मादमृततेजसः[58]।
तस्माद् घृतार्चिर्विश्वात्मा प्रीयतामत्र शङ्करः॥८
यस्तु[59] तेजोमयं ब्रह्म घृतं तच्च[60] व्यवस्थितम्।
घृतपर्वतरूपेण तस्मान्नः[61] पाहि भू[62]धर॥९
अनेन विधिना दद्याद्घृताचलमनुत्तमम्।
महापातकयुक्तोऽपि लोकमाया[63]ति शाङ्करम्॥१०
हंससारसंयुक्तेन किङ्किणीजालमालिना।
विमानेनाप्सरोभिश्च सिद्धविद्याधरैर्वृतः।

विहरेत् पितृभिः सार्द्धं यावदाभू[64]तसंप्लवम्॥११

(अथ रत्नाचलदानविधिः)h

अतः[65] परं प्रवक्ष्यामि रत्नाचलमनुत्तमम्।
मुक्ताफलसहस्रेण पर्वतः स्यादि[66]होत्तमः॥१
मध्यमः पञ्चशतिकस्त्रिशतेनाधमः स्मृतः।
चतुर्थांशेन विष्कम्भपर्वताः स्युः समन्ततः॥२
पूर्वेण वज्रगोमेदैर्दक्षिणे[67] इन्द्रनीलकैः।
पु[69]ष्परागयुतैः कार्यो विद्वद्भिर्गन्धमादनः॥३
वैदूर्यविद्रुमैः पश्चात् स[69]न्मित्रो विपु[70]लाचलः।
पद्मरागैः ससोप[71]र्णोरुत्तरेण तु[72] विन्यसेत्॥४
धान्यपर्वतवत् सर्वमत्रापि परिकल्पयेत्।
तद्वदावाहनं कुर्याद्वृ[73]क्षान्देवांश्च काञ्चनान्॥५
पूजयेत्पुष्पपा[4]नीयैः प्रभाते च विस[75]र्जनम्।
पूर्ववद्गुरुऋत्विग्भ्य इमान्मन्त्रानुदीरयेत्॥६
यथा[76] देवगणाः सर्वे सर्वरत्नेष्वपि[77] स्थिताः।
त्वं च रत्नमयो नित्य[78]मतः पाहि महाच[79]ल॥७
यस्माद्रत्नप्रदानेन वृ[80]ष्टिं प्रकुरुते हरिः।
म[81]हारत्नप्रदानेन तस्मान्नः पाहि प[82]र्वत॥८
अनेन विधिना यस्तु दद्याद्रत्नमयं गिरिम्।
स याति वै[83]ष्णवं लोकममरेश्वरपूजितः॥९
यावत्कल्पशतं सार्द्धं[84] वसेदिह[85] नराधिप[86]।
रूपारोग्यगुणोपेतः सप्तद्वीपाधिपो भवेत्॥१०
ब्रह्महत्यादिकं कि[87]ञ्चिद्यदत्रामुत्र वा कृतम्।
तत्सर्व्वं नाशमायाति गिरिर्वज्रहतो यथा॥११ज

(अथ रूप्याचलदानविधिः)[i]

अतः[88] परं प्रवक्ष्यामि रू[89]प्याचलमनुत्तमम्।
यत्प्रदानान्नरो याति सोमलोकं[90] द्विजोत्तमः॥ १
दशभिः पलसाहस्रैरुत्तमो रा[91]जताचलः॥
पञ्चभिर्मध्यमः प्रोक्तस्तदर्द्धेनाधमः[92] स्मृतः॥२
अशक्तौ[93] विंशतेरर्द्ध कारयेच्छक्तितः[94] सदा।
विष्कम्भपर्वतांस्तद्वत्तुरीयांशेन कल्पयेत्॥३
पूर्ववद्राजता[95]न् कुर्या[96]द् मन्दरादीन्विधानतः।
कलधौतमयांस्तत्र[97] लोकेशानर्चयेद्बुधः॥४
बह्मविष्ण्वर्कवान् कार्यो नितम्बोऽत्र हिरण्म[98]यः।
[अ]राजतं स्याद्यदप्यन्येषां सर्वं तदिह काञ्चनम्॥५
शेष[99]ञ्च पूर्ववत्कुर्याद्धोमजागरणादिकम्।
दद्यात्तद्व[1]त्प्रभाते तु गुरवे रौप्यपर्वतम्॥६
विष्कम्भशैलान्ऋत्विग्भ्यः पू[2]ज्यवस्त्रविभूषणैः।
इमं मन्त्रं पठन् दद्याद्दर्भपाणिर्विमत्सरः॥ ७
पितृणां वल्लभं[3] यस्माद्धर्म[4]स्य शङ्करस्य च।
रा[5]जत पाहि तस्मान्नः शोकसंसारसागरात्॥८
इत्थं निवेश्य[6] यो दद्याद्रा[7]जताचलमुत्तमम्।
गवायु[8]तसहस्रस्य फलम्प्रा[9]प्नोति मानवः॥९
सोमलोके स[10] गन्धर्वैः किन्नरोप्सरसां गणैः।
पूज्यमानो वसेद्विद्वान् यावदाभू[11]तसंप्लवम्॥१० [ब]

(अथ शर्कराचलदानविधिः)[j]

अथातः संप्रवक्ष्यामि शर्कराचल[12]मुत्तमम्।
यस्य[13] प्रदानाद्विष्ण्वर्करुद्रास्तुष्यन्ति सर्वदा॥१
अष्टाभिः शर्कराभारैरुत्तमः स्यान्महाचलः।

चतुर्भिर्मध्यमः प्रोक्तो भाराभ्यामधमः[14] स्मृतः॥२
भारेण वा[15]र्द्धभारेण कुर्याद्यः स्वल्पवित्तवान्।
विष्कम्भपर्वतान् कुर्यात्तुरीयांशेन मानवः॥३
धान्यपर्वतवत् सर्वमासाद्या[16]मरसंयुतम्।
मेरोपरि तद्वच्च स्थाप्य[17] हेमतरुत्रयम्॥४
मन्दारः पारिजातश्च तृतीयः कल्पपादपः॥
एतद्वृक्षत्रयं मूर्ध्नि सर्वेष्वपि निवे[18]शयेत्॥५
हरिचन्दनसन्तानौ पूर्वपश्चिमभागयोः।
निवेश्यौ सर्वशैलेषु विशेषाच्छर्कराचले॥६
मन्द[19]रे कामदेवश्च[20] प्रत्यग्वक्त्रः सदा भवेत्।
गन्धमादनशृङ्गे च[21] धनदः स्यादुदङ्मुखः॥७
प्राङ्मुखो वे[22]दमूर्तिश्च हंसः स्याद्विपुलाचले।
हैमी सुपाश्र्वे सुरभी[23] दक्षिणाभिमुखी भवेत्॥८
धान्यपर्वतवत् सर्वमावाहनम[24]खादिकम्।
कृत्वाथ[25] गुर[26]वे दद्यान्मध्यमं पर्वतोत्तमम्॥९
ऋत्विग्भ्यश्चतुरः शैलानिमान् मन्त्रानुदीरये[27]त्।
सौभाग्यामृतसारोऽयं पर[28]मं शर्करा[29] यतः॥१०
तन्म[30]मानन्दकारी त्वं भव शैलेन्द्र सर्वदा।
अमृतं पिबतां ये तु निपेतुर्भुवि सी[31]कराः॥११
देवानां तत्स[32]मं सोमं पाहि नः शर्कराचल।
म[33]नोभवधनुर्मध्याद्भूता शर्करा यतः॥
तन्मयोऽसि महाशैल पाहि संसारसागरात्॥१२
यो दद्याच्छर्कराशैलमनेन विधिना नरः।
सर्वपाप[34]विनिर्मुक्तः प्र[35]याति शिवमन्दिरम्॥१३
चन्द्रादित्यप्रतीकाशमधिरुह्यानुजीविभिः।
सहैव यानमा[37]तिष्ठेत् स[38] तु विष्णुप्रचोदितः॥१४

ततः कल्पशतान्ते तु सप्तद्वीपाधिपो भवेत्।
आयुरारोग्यसम्पन्नो यावज्जन्मायु[39]तत्रयम्॥१५
भोजनं शक्तितः कुर्यात् सर्वशैले[40] विमत्सरः।
सर्वत्राक्षारलवणमश्नीयात्तदनुज्ञया॥१६
[e]पर्वतोपस्करान् सर्वान् प्रापयेद्ब्राह्मालयम्॥१७
पश्येदिमानप्यधनोऽपि भक्त्या
स्पृशेत् मनुष्यैरिह दीयमानान्।
शृणोति भक्त्याथ मतिं ददाति
निःकल्मषः सोपि दिवं प्रयाति॥१८
दुःस्वप्नं प्रशममुपैति पठ्यमानैः।
शैलेन्द्रैर्भवभयभेदनैर्मनुष्यः।
यः कुर्यात्किमु मुनिपुङ्गवेह सम्यक्।
सत्वात्मा सकलगिरीन्द्रसम्प्रदानम्॥१९

References

a चचि (दान) 346-47 (1-10), 348 (11-12), 348(13-19), 350-51 (20-25), 352-53 (26-27), 353-55 (28-37), 355-56 (38-42), 356 (43-45)
b. चचि (दान) 360-61. Also मपु 84 (लवणाचलकीर्तनम्)
c. चचि (दान) 361-62; विपा (चतुर्थ) 138-39. Also मपु 85 (गुडपर्वतकीर्तनम्)
d. चचि (दान) 364-65; विपा (चतुर्थ) 139-40. Also मपु 86 (सुवर्णाचलकीर्तनम्)
e. चचि (दान) 366; विपा (चतुर्थ) 140-41. Also मपु 87 (तिलाचलकीर्तनम्)
f. चचि (दान) 376
g. चचि (दान) 378-79. Also मपु 87 (घृताचलकीर्तनम्)
h. चचि (दान) 379-81; विपा (चतुर्थ) 143-44. Also मपु 90 (रत्नाचलकीर्तनम्)
i. चचि (दान) 381-82; विपा (चतुर्थ) 145. Also मपु 91 (रौप्याचलकीर्तनम्)
j. चचि (दान) 382-84; विपा (चतुर्थ) 146-47. Also मपु 92

Varient Readings

1. मपु- ०काना०
2. मपु- ०तान्
3. मपु- ०णैः
4. मपु- ०मयान्
5. मपु- ०र्वाल्लोकपालान्निवेशयेत्
6. मपु- ०दत्रपि कारयेत्
7. मपु- ०णं चापि
8. मपु- ०सरः सं०
9. मपु- ०ह्रान कर्तृकत्वकेन त्वं मां पाहि नगोत्तम
10. मपु- ०तः परं
11. विपा- ०डाचलमनुः
12. विपा- ०त्
13. विपा- ०गं प्रा०
14. मपु- ०जां हे०
15. विपा, मपु- ०मजा०
16. विपा- ०त्लो०
17. विपा- ०सोत्तमः
18. मपु- गुडपर्वत देहि वै
19. मपु- ०च्छान्तिं प्रयच्छ मे

20. विपा- सगन्धर्वे गौ०
21. मपु- ततः
22. विपा- ०त् सकलदानस्य फलमाप्यते
23. विपा adds one more line by inserting the second part of this line and the first part of the following line as ०द्दृत्विग्भ्यः प्रतिपादयेत् । सर्वं चैतत् प्रकुर्वीत् स्वल्प०
24. मपु- ०न्मुनिपुङ्गव
25. चचि wrongly reads ऋत्विग्र्भः । विपा- दानमन्त्रमथ शृणु ।
26. विपा- ०गर्भा०
27. विपा- ०बीजा०
28. मपु- ते
29. विपा- पवित्रश्च जगत्यसि
30. मपु- हे०
31. विपा- स्थानं ब्राह्मा०
32. मपु- ०तः परं प्र०
33. मपु- ०कं सनातनम्
34. मपु- मध्यमः पञ्चभिः स्मृतः
35. विपा- राजे०
36. मपु- ०रान्सर्वान्विष्कम्भानभिमतो गिरीन्
37. मपु- ०मुनिपुङ्गव
38. विपा- ०पुङ्गव
39. विपा- ०धे
40. विपा- ०च्छान्ता; मपु- ०न्त्यै
41. विपा- ०नित्वति
42. मपु- ०व्ये कव्ये च य०
43. मपु- ०ला एवाभिरक्षणम्
44. मपु- ०ष्यं समाप्नो०
45. विपा- पुत्रपौत्रञ्च; मपु- पुत्रपौत्रैश्च मोदते
46. मपु- ०तः परं प्र०
47. मपु- ०ताचल०
48. मपु- ०स्त्व०
49. मपु- ०त्तोऽपि यः कुर्याद् द्वाभ्यामिह वि०
50. मपु- ०ण
51. मपु- ०नुच्चा०

52. मपु- ०च्छु०
53. मपु- ०षं
54. मपु- ०न पूर्वं च
55. मपु- मसु०
56. मपु- तं नि०
57. मपु drops ०स०
58. मपु- ०सोः
59. मपु- ०स्माते०
60. मपु- ०द्विद्धचव०
61. मपु- ०त्त्वं
62. मपु- नोऽनिशम्
63. मपु- ०प्नो०
64. चचि, विपा- ०हृ०
65. विपा- ०थातः सं०
66. मपु- ०दनुत्त०
67. मपु- णेनेन्द्र०
68. विपा- पद्मरागैर्युतः; मपु- पद्मरागयुतः
69. मपु- संमि०
70. मपु- ०म०
71. विपा, मपु- ०वर्णे०
72. मपु- च
73. विद्या- ०द्य०
74. मपु- ०गन्धाद्यैः
75. विपा- ०सज्ज; मपु- ०न्यसेत्
76. मपु- ०दा
77. मपु- ०वस्थि०
78. मपु- ०त्यं नमोऽस्तु सदाऽचल
79. विपा- ०ब०
80. मपु- तु०
81. मपु- सदा
82. विपा- सर्वतः
83. मपु- ष्णुसालोक्यम०
84. मपु- ०ग्रं
85. मपु- ०च्चे०

86. विपा- ०पः
87. विपा- चेत्स्यादिहाप्यमु.
88. मपु- ०थातः सं.
89. विपा- रौ०
90. विपा- ०कमनुत्तमम्
91. मपु- र०
92. चचि- ०रः
93. मपु- ०क्तो
94. मपु- ०तस्त०
95. विपा- ०रा
96. मपु- ०र्वन्
97. मपु- ०द्वल्लो०
98. विपा- ०ण्यम०
99. मपु- षं तु
1. मपु- ०तः प्र०
2. विपा- सम्पूज्य स्रग्वि०
3. मपु- ०भो
4. मपु- ०रीन्द्राणां शिव०
5. मपु- पाहि राजत तस्मात्त्वं
6. मपु- ०द्य
7. मपु- ०द्र०
8. मपु- ०मयुतदानस्य
9. विपा- ०मा०
10. विपा- सग०
11. चचि ०हू०
12. मपु- ०शै०
13. विपा- ०स्मात्प्र०
14. चचि- ०रः
15. विपा- चा०
16. विपा- ०द्य०
17. विपा, मपु- ०प्यं
18. मपु- ०योज०
19. मपु- ०न्द०
20. मपु- ०स्तु

21. मपु- तु
22. विपा- देव०
23. मपु- ०भिर्द०
24. विपा- ०सुखा०; मपु- ०विधानकम्
25. मपु- तु
26. विपा, मपु- ०रु०
27. मपु- ०यन्
28. विपा- ०मः; मपु- ०र्वतः
29. विपा- ०राचलः; मपु- ०रायु०
30. मपु- ०स्मादान०
31. मपु- शी०
32. विपा- ०तस,०; मपु- ०त्समुत्थस्त्वं
33. चचि- मम भुतु मध्या यदु०
34. मपु- ०पैर्वि०
35. मपु- स याति परमं पदम्
36. मपु- ०न्द्रतारार्कसङ्का०
37. विपा- ०नं तिष्ठेत्तु
38. मपु- ०त्तत्र वि०
39. मपु- ०ब्र्बुद०
40. मपु- ०लेष्वम०

Notes

क- चचि adds तत्र धान्यपर्वतदानं तावदुच्यते तदेव पद्मपुराणे ।
ख- चचि begins all the sections with पुलस्त्य उवाच ।
विपा has पाद्मे पुलस्त्य उवाच ।
ग- चचि adds इति पद्मपुराणोक्तो लवणाचलदानविधिः ।
घ- विपा drops the line.
ङ- चचि adds इति पद्मपुराणोक्तः सुवर्णाचलदानविधिः ।
च- चचि adds पद्मपुराणात् ।
छ- चचि inserts पद्मपुराणात्. Here the introductory expression पुलस्त्य उवाच is missing.
ज- चचि adds इति पद्मपुराणोक्तो रत्नपर्वतदानविधिः ।
झ- विपा drops this line.
ञ- चचि adds इति पद्मपुराणोक्तो रूप्याचलदानविधिः ।
ट- विपा, मपु drop verses 17-19

APPENDIX I-B

(अथ पञ्चधेनुदानविधिः)

विधानं तिलधेनोर्यत्तच्छृणुष्व नराधिप ।
षोडशहाटकमयी धेनुश्चतुर्भिर्वत्सको भवेत् ॥१
इक्षुदण्डमयाः पादाः दन्ताः पुष्पमयाः शुभाः ।
नासा गन्धमयी तस्या जिह्वा गुडमयी तथा ॥२
पुच्छे स्रक् कल्पनीया स्यात् घण्टाभरणभूषिता ।
ईदृशीः कल्पयित्वा तु स्वर्णशृङ्गीं प्रकल्पयेत् ॥३
रौप्यखुरां कांस्यदोहां पूर्वधेनुविधानतः ।
एवंविधानां तां कृत्वा ब्राह्मणाय तु दापयेत् ॥४
कृष्णाजिनस्थितां धेनुं वासोभिर्भूषितां शुभैः ।
सूत्रेण सूत्रितां कृत्वा पञ्चरत्नसमन्विताम् ॥५
सर्वौषधिसमायुक्तां मन्त्रपूतान्तु दापयेत् ।
अन्नं मे जायतां सद्यः पानं सर्वरसांस्तथा ॥६
कामान् सम्पादयास्माकं तिलधेनोर्द्विजार्पिता ।
गृह्णामि देवि त्वां भक्त्या कुटुम्बार्थे विशेषतः ॥७
भरस्त्र कामैर्मां सर्वैस्तिलधेनोः नमोस्तु ते ।
एवं विधानतो दत्ता तिलधेनुर्नृपोत्तम ॥८
सर्वकामसमावाप्तिं कुरुते नात्र संशयः ।
जलधेनुस्तथैवेह कुम्भे धेनुः प्रकल्पिता ॥९
दत्ता तु विधिना कामान् सद्यः सर्वान् प्रयच्छति ।
धेनुश्च तत्त्वतो दत्ता पौर्णमास्यां नराधिप ॥१०
पितृंस्तारयते दुर्गान्निरकात् कामदा भवेत् ।
घृतधेनुस्तथा दत्ता विधानेन विचक्षणैः ॥११

सर्वकामं समाप्नोति कुरुते, कान्तिदा भवेत् ।
रसधेनुं तथा दत्त्वा कार्त्तिके मासि पार्थिव ॥१२
सर्वान् कामानवाप्नोति नित्यं सुगतिभाग्भवेत् ॥१३

References

चचि (दान) 406-7

Notes

क- चचि has इति पद्मपुराणोक्तः पञ्चधेनुदानविधिः ।

APPENDIX II-A

(विश्वव्रतम्)

दशम्यामेकभक्ताशी समान्ते दशधेनवः ।
दिशश्च काञ्चनीर्दद्यान्नारीरूपा महीपते ॥१
तिलद्रोणोपरिगताः सार्वभौमो भवेन्नृप ।
एतद्विश्वव्रतं नाम महापातकनाशनम् ॥२[क]

References

जक 394

Notes

क- It is introduced as पद्मपुराणोक्तं विश्वव्रतम्.

APPENDIX II-B

(लक्ष्मीनारायणव्रतम्)

पञ्चदश्यां शुक्लपक्षे फाल्गुनस्य नरोत्तम ।
पाषण्डपतितांश्चैव तथैवान्त्यावसायिनः ॥१
नास्तिकान्भिन्नवृत्तींश्च पापिनश्चापि नालपेत् ।
नारायणो गतमनाः पुरुषो नियतेन्द्रियः ॥२
तिष्ठन्व्रजन्प्रस्खलंश्च क्षुते वापि जनार्दनम् ।
कीर्तयेत्तत्क्रियाकाले सप्तकृत्वः पुनः पुनः ॥३
लक्ष्म्या समन्वितं देवमर्चयति जनार्दनम् ॥४
सन्ध्याव्युपरमे चेन्दुस्वरूपं हरिमीश्वरम् ।
रविं च लक्ष्मीं सञ्चिन्त्य सम्यगर्घ्येण पूजयेत् ॥५
श्रीर्निशा चन्द्ररूपस्त्वं वासुदेव जगत्पते ।
मनोभिलषितं देव पूरयस्व नमो नमः ॥६
मन्त्रेणनेन दत्वार्घ्यं देवदेवस्य भक्तितः ।
नक्तं भुञ्जीत मौनेन तैलक्षारविवर्जितम् ॥७
तथैव चैत्रे वैशाखे ज्येष्ठे च मुनिसत्तम ।
अर्चयेच्च यथाप्रोक्तं मासि मासि च तद्दिने ॥८
निष्पादितं भवेदेकं पारणं दाल्भ्य भक्तितः ।
द्वितीयं तत्र वक्ष्यामि पारणं तन्निबोध मे ॥९
आषाढे श्रावणे मासि प्राप्ते भाद्रपदे तथा ।
तथैवाऽश्वयुजेऽभ्यर्च्य श्रीधरं च श्रिया सह ॥१०
सम्यक् चन्द्रमसे दत्त्वा भुञ्जीतार्घ्यं यथाविधि ।
द्वितीयमेतदाख्यातं तृतीयमपि पारणम् ॥११
प्रतिपूज्य ततो दद्याद्ब्राह्मणेभ्यश्च दक्षिणाम् ।

प्रतिमासं प्रवक्ष्यामि प्राशनं कायशुद्धये ॥१२
चतुरः प्रथमं मासान्पञ्चगव्यमुदाहृतम् ।
कुशोदकं तथैवान्यदुक्तं मासचतुष्टयम् ॥१३
गीतवाद्यादिकं रात्रौ तथा कृष्णकथाः शुभाः ।
कारयेद्देवदेवस्य पारणे पारणे गते ।
जनार्दनं सलक्ष्मीकमर्चयेत् प्रथमं ततः ॥१४
सश्रीकं श्रीधरं तद्वत्तृतीयं भूतिकेशवम् ।
एवं संपूज्य विधिवत्सपत्नीकं जनार्दनम् ॥१५
नाप्नोतीष्टवियोगार्तिं पुमान् योषिदथापि वा ।
यावन्ति जन्मान्यसुखं नाप्नोतीष्टवियोगजम् ॥१६
देवस्य तु प्रभावेण मरणे प्राप्नुते स्मृतम् ।
कुले सतां स्फीतधने भुङ्क्ते भोगान्यथेप्सितान् ॥१७

References

जक 775

Notes

क- जक adds इति विष्णुधर्मोक्तं लक्ष्मीनारायणव्रतम् ।

APPENDIX II-C

(घृतस्नानव्रतम्)

[क]द्वादश्यां पञ्चदश्यां वा गव्येन पयसा हरेः ।
स्नपनं दैत्यशार्दूल पहापातकनाशनम् ॥१
द्वादश्यां तुलसीपत्रैर्यः पूजां कुरुते हरेः ।
वैकुण्ठे विपुलान् भोगान् भुक्त्वा सायुज्यमाप्नुयात् ॥२
कार्त्तिकशुक्लद्वादश्यां संपूज्य मधुसूदनम् ।
ततस्तु तुलसीपूजां कुरुते यच्छृणुष्व मे ॥३
अतीतजन्मसाहस्रे यत् कृतं पापसञ्चयम् ।
सर्वं तु सहसा दग्ध्वा परं सायुज्यमाप्नुयात् ॥४
अयने चोत्तरे प्राप्ते यः स्नापयति केशवम् ।
घृतप्रस्थेन पयसा सकलैनो व्यपोहति ॥५
घृतस्नानं च देवस्य तस्मिन् काले समाहितः ।
स्नप्यमानं च पश्यन्ति ये घृतेनोत्तरायणे ।
ते यान्ति विष्णुसालोक्यं पूर्वपापविवर्जिताः ॥६
कपिलां विप्रमुख्याय ददात्यनुदिनं तु यः ।
स्नानं विष्णोः प्रयच्छन्ति ये घृतेनोत्तरायणे ॥७

References

वीमि (पूजा) 152 (1-6); जक 878 (5, 7).

Notes

क- Introduced as विष्णुधर्मोत्तरे पुलस्त्यः ।

APPENDIX I I I

(तीर्थयात्रापर्व)

[a]पुलस्त्य उवाच ।

अनेन तव धर्मज्ञ प्रश्रयेण दमेन च ।
सत्येन च महाभाग तुष्टोऽस्मि तव सर्वशः ॥२२
यस्येदृशस्ते धर्मोऽयं पितृभक्त्याश्रितोऽनघ ।
तेन पश्यसि मां पुत्र प्रीतिश्चापि मम त्वयि ॥२३
अमोघदर्शी भीष्माहं ब्रूहि किं करवाणि ते ।
यद्वक्ष्यसि कुरुश्रेष्ठ तस्य दातास्मि तेऽनघ ॥२४

भीष्म उवाच ।

प्रीते त्वयि महाभाग सर्वलोकाभिपूजिते ।
कृतमित्येव मन्येऽहं यदहं दृष्टवान्प्रभुम् ॥२५
यदि त्वहमनुग्राह्यस्तव धर्मभृतां वर ।
वक्ष्यामि हृत्स्थं सन्देहं तन्मे त्वं वक्तुमर्हसि ॥२६
अस्ति मे भगवन्कश्चित्तीर्थेभ्यो धर्मसंशय ।
तमहं श्रोतुमिच्छामि पृथक्सङ्कीर्तितं त्वया ॥२७
प्रदक्षिणं यः पृथिवीं करोत्यमितविक्रम ।
किं फलं तस्य विप्रर्षे तन्मे ब्रूहि तपोधन ॥२८

पुलस्त्य उवाच ।

हन्त तेऽहं प्रवक्ष्यामि यदृषीणां परायणम् ।
तदेकाग्रमनास्तात शृणु तीर्थेषु यत्फलम् ॥२९
यस्य हस्तौ च पादौ च मनश्चैव सुसंयतम् ।

विद्या तपश्च कीर्तिश्च स तीर्थफलमश्नुते ॥३०
प्रतिग्रहादुपावृत्तः सन्तुष्टो नियतः शुचिः ।
अहङ्कारनिवृत्तश्च स तीर्थफलमश्नुते ॥३१
अकल्कको निरारम्भो लघ्वाहारो जितेन्द्रियः ।
विमुक्तः सर्वदोषैर्यः स तीर्थफलमश्नुते ॥३२
अक्रोधनश्च राजेन्द्र सत्यशीलो दृढव्रतः ।
आत्मोपमश्च भूतेषु स तीर्थफलमश्नुते ॥३३
ऋषिभिः क्रतवः प्रोक्ता वेदेष्विह यथाक्रमम् ।
फलं चैव यथातत्त्वं प्रेत्य चेह च सर्वशः ॥३४
न ते शक्या दरिद्रेण यज्ञाः प्राप्तुं महीपते ।
बहूपकरणा यज्ञा नानासंभारविस्तराः ॥३५
प्राप्यन्ते पार्थिवैरेते समृद्धैर्वा नरैः क्वचित् ।
नार्थन्यूनोपकरणैरेकात्मभिरसंहतैः ॥३६
यो दरिद्रैरपि विधिः शक्यः प्राप्तुं नरेश्वर ।
तुल्यो यज्ञफलैः पुण्यैस्तं निबोध युधां वर ॥३७
ऋषीणां परमं गुह्यमिदं भरतसत्तम ।
तीर्थाभिगमनं पुण्यं यज्ञैरपि विशिष्यते ॥३८
अनुपोष्य त्रिरात्राणि तीर्थान्यनभिगम्य च ।
अदत्त्वा काञ्चनं गाश्च दरिद्रो नाम जायते ॥३९
अग्निष्टोमादिभिर्यज्ञैरिष्ट्वा विपुलदक्षिणैः ।
न तत्फलमवाप्नोति तीर्थाभिगमनेन यत् ॥४०

[b]इदं सत्यं द्विजातीनां साधूनामात्मजस्य च ।
सुहृदां च जपेत्कर्णे शिष्यस्यानुगतस्य च ॥८४
इदं धर्म्यमिदं पुण्यमिदं मेध्यमिदं सुखम् ।
इदं स्वर्ग्यमिदं रम्यमिदं पावनमुत्तमम् ॥८५

महर्षीणामिदं गुह्यं सर्वपापप्रमोचनम् ।
अधीत्य द्विजमध्ये च निर्मलत्वमवाप्नुयात् ॥८६
यश्चेदं शृणुयान्नित्यं तीर्थपुण्यं सदा शुचिः ।
जातीः स स्मरते वह्वीर्नाकपृष्ठे च मोदते ॥८७
गम्यान्यपि च तीर्थानि कीर्तितान्यगमानि च ।
मनसा तानि गच्छेत सर्वतीर्थसमीक्षया ॥८८
ऋषिभिर्देवकल्पैश्च श्रितानि सुकृतैषिभिः ॥८९
एवं त्वमपि कौरव्य विधिनानेन सुव्रत ।
व्रज तीर्थानि नियतः पुण्यं पुण्येन वर्धते ॥९०
भावितैः कारणैः पूर्वमास्तिक्याच्छ्रुतिदर्शनात् ।
प्राप्यन्ते तानि तीर्थानि सद्भिः शिष्टानुदर्शिभिः ॥९१
नाव्रतो नाकृतात्मा च नाशुचिर्न च तस्करः ।
स्नाति तीर्थेषु कौरव्य न च वक्रमतिर्नरः ॥९२
त्वया तु सम्यग्वृत्तेन नित्यं धर्मार्थदर्शिना ।
पितरस्तारितास्तात सर्वे च प्रपितामहाः ॥९३
पितामहपुरोगाश्च देवाः सर्षिगणा नृप ।
तव धर्मेण धर्मज्ञ नित्यमेवाभितोषिताः ॥९४
अवाप्स्यसि च लोकान्वै वसूनां वासवोपम ।
कीर्तिं च महतीं भीष्म प्राप्स्यसे भुवि शाश्वतीम् ॥९५

References

a- महाभारत आरण्यक 80.
b- महाभारत आरण्यक 85.

Notes

क- महाभारत आरण्यक 80.41 to 85.83 describes various tirthas.

Chapter 8

Sanskrit texts consulted

Ācārabhūṣaṇa of Tryambakarāma, Poona, 1908.
Ācāramayūkha of Bhaṭṭa Nīlakaṇṭha. Ed. M.G.B.Bakre, Bombay, 1915.
Ācārendu of Tryambaka Mate. Ed. D.S.Agashe, Poona, 1909.
Agni Purāṇa. Ed. Pancanana Tarkaratna, Vangavasi Press, Calcutta.
Aparārka on Yājñavalkyasmṛti. Ed. H.N.Apte, Poona, 1904.
Bālambhaṭṭī on Mitākṣarā.Ed. J.R. Gharpure, Bombay, 1914.
Bhaviṣyapurāṇa. Kṣemarāja Śrīkṛṣṇadāsa, Venkatesvara Press, Bombay.
Caturvargacintāmaṇi of Hemādri, 4 vols. Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1873-1911.
Dānaratnākara of Caṇḍesvara.
Dānasāgara of Ballālasena. Ed.Śyāmācraṇa Kaviratna, Śaka 1835-1841.
Dharmapradīpa of Bhairava Datta Sarma. Ksemaraja Sri Krsnadasa. Bombay.
Dharmaśāstra-saṅgraha. Ed.M. S. Amarpurkar.Bombay, 1883.
Gadādharapaddhati of Gadādhara Rājaguru. Ed. Sadāśiva Misra. Calcutta. 1904.
Jayasiṃhakalpadruma. Lakshmi Venkatesvara Press, Kalyan, 1925.
Kālamādhava or *Kālanirṇaya* of Mādhavācārya, Benares, 1909.
Kālamādhavakārikā of Vaidyanātha Suri. Alwar.
Kālatatvavivecana of Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa. Ed. Nand Kishore Sharma. Banaras, 1932.
Kalyāpaddharmasarvasva. Sadashiva Sharma, Calcutta, 1933.
Mahābhārata, Āraṇyakaparva.Ed. V. S. Sukthankar, Poona, 1942.
Matsyapurāṇa. Ed. Pancanana Tarkaratna, Vangavasi Press, Calcutta, 1316 B. S.
Muhūrtacintāmaṇi of Rāmadaivajña. Bombay, 1902.
Nirṇayāmṛta of Allādinātha. Bombay, 1895.
Nirnayasindhu of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa. Ed.Vasudeva Sarma. Bombay, 1906.
Nṛsiṃhīya-prayogapārijāta. Ed.Vasudeva Lakshmana Padasikara, Bombay, 1916.
Padmapurāṇa. Ed. H.N.Apte, Poona, 1893.
Pradīpatraya (Śuddhipradīpa, Prāyaścittapradīpa and Kṛtyapradīpa) of Kṛṣṇamitra. Ed. Vishwanath Shastri, Banaras, 1954.

Prāyaścittamayūkha of Bhaṭṭa Nīlakaṇṭha. Ed. S.A.Y. Dhupkar, Bombay, 1940.

Puruṣārthacintāmaṇi of Viṣṇubhaṭṭa. Bombay, 1929.

Saṃskārakaustubha of Anantadeva. Bombay, 1913.

Saṃskārapaddhati of Bhāskara Shastri, Banaras, 1946.

Saṃskāraratnamālā of Bhaṭṭa Gopīnātha Dīkṣita. Ed. K.S.Agashe & B.S. Phadke, Poona, 1899.

Smṛticandrikā of Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa, Ed. L. Srinivasacarya: Āhnikakāṇḍa, Mysore, 1914; Āśaucakāṇḍa, Mysore 1921; Śrāddhakāṇḍa, Mysore, 1918.

Smṛtimuktāphala of Vaidyanātha Dīkṣita. Ed. J.R.Gharpure, Bombay, 1937-1940.

Smṛtisandarbha (Gurumandal Series), Vol. IV. Ed. M. R. More. Calcutta,1953.

Smṛtisāroddhāra of Vishvambhara Trivedin, Banaras.

Smṛtitattva (Tithitattva, Srāddhatattva and Prāyaścittatattva) of Raghunandana. Ed. Jibananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta, 1895.

Śrāddhacandrikā of Divākara, Banaras, 1956.

Śrādhakalpalatā of Nandapaṇḍita, Banaras, 1933.

Śrāddhamañjarī of Bapu Bhatta Kalakara, Poona, 1960.

Śuklayajuḥśākhīya- Karmakāṇḍapradīpa. Ed. Gangadhar Shastri Datar, Bombay, 1921.

Tīrthacintāmaṇi of Vācaspatimiśra. Ed. Kamalakṛṣṇa Smṛtitīrtha. Calcutta,1912.

Vidhānapārijāta of Anantabhaṭṭa. Taraprasanna Vidyaratna, Calcutta, 1909-1912.

Vīramitrodaya of Mitramiśra: Āhnikaprakāśa, Ed. P.N.Sharma, Banaras, 1913; Pūjāprakāśa, Ed. V.P. Sharma. Banaras, 1913; Samayaprakāśa, Banaras, 1935; Śrāddhaprakāśa, Banaras, 1935; Śuddhiprakāśa, Banaras, 1937.

Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa. Ksemaraja Srikrsnadasa, Venkatesvara Press, Bombay.